

164

REFLECTIONS

UPON

Modern Fanaticism, &c.

m
pa

REFLECTIONS



Modern Manuscripts &c.

REFLECTIONS

UPON

Modern Fanaticism.

IN TWO LETTERS,

TO

Doct^r B R E T T,

And the AUTHOR of a late Pamphlet ironically intitled,

Mr. Leslie's D E F E N C E

FROM SOME

Dangerous and Erroneous P R I N C I P L E S.

By MATTHIAS EARBERRY, *Presbyter of*
the Church of England.

ISAIAH XLIV. 20.

*He feedeth of Ashes, a deceived Heart hath turned him
aside, that he cannot deliver his Soul, nor say, is there
not a Lie in my Mouth?*

L O N D O N:

Printed by N. MIST in *Great Carter Lane*, and Sold
by J. MORPHEW near *Stationers-Hall*. 1720.

Price Two Shillings.

REFLECTIONS

UPON

Modern Fanaticism.

In Two Letters,

TO

DOCTOR BRET.

And the Author of a late Pamphlet ironically intitled,

MR. LITTLE'S



Doctrines and Principles.

By MATTHIAS FARRER, Minister of the Church of England.

LONDON.

Printed by N. Mearns in Great Court Lane, and sold by J. Mearns at the Stationers-Hall, 1720.

LONDON.

Printed by N. Mearns in Great Court Lane, and sold by J. Mearns at the Stationers-Hall, 1720.

Price Two Shillings.



A
LETTER

TO

Doctor Brett,

*Concerning the NEW SEPARATION, in
which the Four Controverted Points of
the Essentialists are brought down to
Mr. Leslie's Four Marks.*

REVEREND SIR,



YOU was pleased about two Years
and an Half since, to send a very
obliging Letter in my Behalf to a
Friend, for which I have ever since
ow'd you some Acknowledgments,
which Business of greater Consequence has hi-
therto hindered me from paying. I assure you,
Sir, I design to handle you like a Gentleman,
and leave the World to judge, whether you will

come off better than those who have been treated like Porters.

As it does the Reader, for whose Benefit this Letter shall be printed, no Service, to be put in Mind of personal Unkindnesses betwixt the Doctor and my self; I shall omit that Topick, being to strike at the Root of the present Controversy in Hand, in order to which, I shall in the first Chapter, treat in general concerning our Rule of Faith.

CHAP. I.

Concerning the Christian Rule of Faith in general.

WE may for ever dispute concerning the Scriptures and Tradition, unless we proceed regularly Step by Step, until we are carried to the Summit of our Endeavours.

For this Reason I have fix'd upon this first Topick in our Christian Rule of Faith.

Our Adversaries, the Separatists, will not deny these few *Postulata*.

1. That the Professors of the Christian Religion are a Society united for the promoting the eternal Happiness of Mankind.

2. That Christ is the supream Lawgiver to this Society.

3. That no Laws can be made in this Society, but in Subordination to Christ, the supream Head thereof.

Having

Having laid down these *Postulata*, I define the Christian Rule of Faith, to be the Rule by which the Laws of this Society are conveyed down to us.

To illustrate this by an obvious Example; if a Man should ask, me what is the Rule of our *English* Law, I would tell him, that one Rule will not serve to answer his Question. The Rule of our Statute-Law is our printed Statute-Book; the Rule of our common Law is Custom, and the Rule of Chancery is the Records of that Court.

To come therefore at the Knowledge of our Christian Rule of Faith, we must lay down this Axiom.

1. That it is essential to a Law's being a Law to Society, that it be sufficiently known.

2. To know what is a Law, it must have certain Marks, that it proceeds either immediately from the supream Legislative Power in that Society, or mediately by its deputed Authority.

I conclude the Manner in which a Law is made sufficiently known, is, the Rule of that Law, as a Compilation of Acts of Parliament, which we call a Statute-Book, is the Rule of a Statute-Law; and a Collection of adjudged Cases is the Rule of Common-Law; so the Rule of Christian Faith is the Means by which the Laws of Christ are made known to us.

I do not therefore pretend to say, that we can have no other Rule of Faith except the Scripture, because this is restraining the Power of God, who may, by Revelation, appoint Institutions and Signs, to attend them, for a Series of
Ages,

Ages, which shall as fully prove the Truth of the Matters of Fact as possible; nay, such are the Proofs for the Scriptures themselves.

But still the different Manner in which the Law is conveyed, is a different Rule: However, at the same time we must not part with this Axiom, that it is essential to a Law to be a Law to Society, that it be sufficiently known.

I conclude, that no Divine Law is a Divine Law to us, unless it is plainly and evidently conveyed to us. Upon the whole, the Means by which it is conveyed is the Rule of our Christian Faith, and so let this Definition stand 'till you, Reverend Sir, or your Friends can give a better.

CHAP. II.

In what Manner the Scriptures are said to be a Rule of Faith.

THE Scriptures are, at least, one Rule of our Faith, because they were at first writ by inspired Writers, with this Design, that they should be a written Law for Christians, and should be standing Records, as our Statute-Books are at this Day.

Thus the Will of God is evidently conveyed to us therein; for if we are previously satisfied by rational and infallible Proofs, that the Scriptures are the Law of God, which, that they are, I shall hereafter prove: It remains, that

that what is contained therein is Law to us, and requires to be observed as such.

I need not say how many have been fatally led into Sorrow by the Weakness of their Judgments, in not distinguishing the Laws contained in that sacred Book.

For the Scriptures are a Digest of Divine Laws mixed with the Ecclesiastical History of the Church of God, from the Creation of the World to the Times of Christianity; together with the Secular History, so far as the Church is affected thereby.

All therefore contained in Scripture is not Law to every Man alike; nor are the Matters of Fact contained therein Law; for, in that Case, Divine Laws would be contradictory in themselves.

Considering the Scope and View of the Scriptures, we must separate the History from the Body of Law, and we must call nothing a Law which is not therein a Divine Command; nor is it nevertheless a Law to us, unless the Command is directed to us in the Circumstances in which we are at that time: All which must be pointed out as plainly, as evidently, as the Law it self, for Circumstances are the best and surest Interpreters of Laws.

The Passover was a Law to the *Jews*, it was observed by our Blessed Saviour; and nevertheless, it is no Law to his Disciples and Followers to this Day.

It is therefore equally necessary to be known to whom it is a Law, as that it is such; for
the

the Scriptures are as equally a Statute-Book to the *Jews* as to the Christians; and as the Scripture is moreover an History, every Fact there recorded is not a Law; nor is every Practice in Church Discipline a standing and irrevocable Law, because Matters of Discipline are not of a standing, but mutable Nature: The Church in the Scripture may be recorded to do one thing, and the same Ecclesiastical Power may abrogate its own Laws, and make new.

I call therefore a standing Divine Law, a Divine Command that we shall observe, and such Laws the Church below cannot repeal, because they are the Laws of Christ.

But Church Acts recorded in Scripture may be repealed by the same Authority by which they were made in a new Act.

I have premised this, to shew the Weakness of some who suppose every thing recorded in Scripture to be a Law, whereas it is to be consulted not only as a Book of Legislature, but as a Record, which are different things; for though every Book of Legislature is a Record, every Record is not a Law.

All our Saviour practised is not a Law to us, nor what *St. Paul* practised when he went to a Purification in the Temple, nor what *St. Peter* practised when *St. Paul* reprov'd him to his Face; yet these are all recorded in the Holy Scriptures, but not recorded as Laws to us.

St. Paul's saying it was better not to marry than marry, does not establish Celibacy amongst all Christians as a divine Law; yet if God should enact

enact one thing to be better than another, this would certainly be a Law: However, this was not formed into a Law; it was no more than the prudential Counsel of *St. Paul* adapted to those Times of Persecution.

I conclude from what has been said, that to know what is a Divine Law in the Scriptures, and whom it concerns, it must have these Marks.

1. It must appear to be the Command of God.
2. It must appear literally to be deliver'd to us, or in the same Circumstances with those to whom it was delivered in Relation to that Law.

By these two Marks we easily arrive at our Scope, and bring down that Dispute likewise to the Test.

For Example, God is said to speak the Ten Commandments from Mount *Sinai*, and from thence he proceeds to farther Laws, which more nearly respected the lost Government of the Tribes.

The Commandments (except that particular of keeping the Sabbath Day) respect us equally as them, because our Circumstances are the same with theirs in respect to those Laws; for we are to have no more Gods than the *Israelites* before us; we have Fathers as well as they, who consequently have the same Right to Respect and Reverence as theirs; our Bodies are united to our Souls by no stronger Tenure than our Forefathers were; and consequently, are equally exposed to Separation by Violence: Our Wives and Goods we look upon still as our Property, and therefore Laws to preserve them are as agreeable

agreeable to our Constitutions as to those who liv'd Three Thousand Years since.

But the Division immediately appears, *Ex. xx. 24, 25.* *An offering of earth shalt thou make unto me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt-offerings, and thy peace-offering, thy sheep and thine oxen, in all places where I record my name I will come unto thee, and bless thee; and if thou wilt make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone; for if thou lift thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it.* Now the very Reason of that Command is ceas'd as to us, nor moreover have we Altars for Burnt-Offerings, or Sacrifices like theirs; this consequently is no Law to us.

When God commands or forbids, and deduces the Reason thereof from the Nature of the thing it self, such a Command or Precept is of an eternal Obligation, and consequently it is a Law to all Men, in all Ages, because Reason is immutable, and all Mankind are in the same Circumstance in respect to that Law, where God commands, *That the blood shall not be eaten because it is the Life, Lev. xvii. 11.* This is an eternal Law; for the same Reason Tithes are a Law to us, because they have the same moral Obligation.

It is said, *Deut. xx. 18.* That in a Siege the Trees which yield Meat shall not be cut down, *Because the tree of the field is man's Life.* This is a Law of Obligation to the End of the World (or at least I conceive so;) and from that Reason this General Precept takes its Rise, that in a War,

War, nothing shall be destroyed which yields Provision for Man's Life; the Fountains of Water shall not be poisoned, nor the Corn rooted up in the Ground before it is ripe; nor even the Dung cast into the River which is to be laid thereon.

Thus far, I hope, the Reader will agree that I have advanced nothing obscure and intricate, and, as our Enemies must necessarily endeavour to strike at something I have already laid down, I long to know where they will begin their Attack.

Having thus explained upon the Marks of a Divine Law, recorded in Writing, another Question arises which I design for the following Chapter.

CHAP. III.

Whether there can be any other Rule of Faith except the Scriptures?

IT is no Contradiction in Terms, that Religion should subsist without a written Rule, because God may have several extraordinary Methods to convey and make known his Laws to us.

He may, if he pleases, continue Inspiration from Age to Age, and make the Mouth of the Priest a Law to the People; he may deliver his Will by Signs in the Air, or by oracular Means.

But this we may take for granted, that which is imperfectly delivered is not his Will, or a Law to us; for, as Disobedience to his Will is attended with certain Punishments, he would be unjust to inflict Punishments for the Transgression of uncertain Laws.

Outward Signs and Institutions may attend a Law, and be transmitted down to future Ages, which, undoubtedly, if they have certain, true and infallible Marks, may be a Rule of Faith, and upon an equal Foot with written Records.

Some may call this, if they please, Tradition; let the Papists and new Separatists triumph over this imaginary Concession in their Favour. I design speedily to withdraw my Smiles, and frown upon them as before. This I refer to the next Chapter; I shall only lay down here this Conclusion, that if any other Methods can be supposed with equal Certainty to convey the Divine Will to us, such lay a just Claim to be our Rule of Faith.

But, to dispute *a Possibili ad Esse*, is no strong Logick. The Papist, if he pleases, may beg, that I will suffer his Pope to have the infallible Law of God in his Mouth, tho' he has the Devil in his Heart: But I design to enter a *Caveat* against him, because he is a very Pretender.

The Astrologer may beg, that I will let the Stars have some Share in giving Laws to the World, which Favour I design to bestow only upon the Moon, for several weighty Reasons, and, moreover, to oblige our Essentialists.

Methinks I hear them calling out for Tradition, that dear Idol, which they have worshipped so long, as some do the Devil, only to be left in the Lurch; that very Tradition will tear them in Pieces, destroy their new essential Points, and carry the poor tatter'd Remains of their Captivity into Exile.

CHAP. IV.

Whether Tradition may be called a Rule of Faith?

TRadition is so complex a Term, that I wonder any clear and just Scheme can ever be formed therefrom, whereas Truth is ever drawn from Simplicity: All the beautiful Theorems and noble Propositions in *Euclid* are extracted from plain, easy, and unaffected Definitions and Axioms; nor can even a Question be resolved in *Algebra*, 'till the Terms are cleared from the Rubbish that clogs them, and conceals the Truth.

Tradition, considered without Distinction, is so far from being a Rule of Faith, that it is the Rule of all the Falshood in the World: 'Tis the Vehicle of Lies, Dreams, Visions, Superstition, Paganism, and the whole Multiplicity of Heathen Gods together; the Errors and Innovations of Popery, to which I may add, the new Advances of Enthusiasm with our Essentialists.

To clear therefore the Tradition, for which I shall contend, from the gross Imperfections of that for which our Adversaries dispute, I shall first repeat, that a Rule of Faith cannot be built upon an Uncertainty, neither can it be uncertain in it self, because Justice and Equity require, that not only Laws should be plain, but also that they should be plainly conveyed to those whom they oblige.

Mr. *Leslie*, whose Service to Religion can never be too gratefully remembered, in his Controversy against the Deists, has laid down four Marks which will stand all the Attacks of the Deists, and by farther Improvement, destroy Popery and Enthusiasm, and give them a lasting Repose in their Grave.

1. That the Matter of Fact be such as that Mens outward Senses, their Eyes and Ears may judge of it.

2. That it be done publicly in the Face of the World.

3. That not only publick Monuments be kept up in Memory of it, but some outward Actions to be performed.

4. That such Monuments, and such Actions or Observances be instituted, and commence from the Time that the Fact *was done*.

A Matter of Fact with these Attestations cannot, morally speaking, be false; the Scriptures are founded upon such Evidence, and so likewise are the firmest Proofs for the Christian Religion.

These Marks will stand the Test of all the Errors that have ever prevailed, and, in vain, has

has Monsieur *Le Clerc*, with a whole Tribe of Enemies to Christianity, endeavoured to overthrow them by one single Instance.

Whereas Tradition, in its full Latitude, is the fruitful Mother of Lies, and, as such, it is obtruded upon the World, first, by the Papists, and secondly, by a more unaccountable Sect than they, in some Respects.

However, crude as it is, our Essentialists, and particularly Dr. *Brett*, argue upon its Bottom, make it an unerring and infallible Rule, and presume from thence to excommunicate all except themselves, and deal Damnation with a liberal Hand.

They must paint God in all the Forms of Horror, to make him give Men such an uneven Rule, to require them to walk straight by, and damn them for the Non-performance of Conditions himself has made precarious; for if they pretend, that any Tradition beneath these Marks can come up to a Rule of Faith, I shall, in its due Place, prove that such Facts may be false, and then, I hope, they have done with their pretended Rule of Faith, unless they affect to make God as black as the *Calvinists* render theirs, dress him as a Tyrant, another *Pharoah*, and a God who seems to want Occasions to destroy his Creatures.

Moreover, it is a Contradiction, that a Law can be uncertainly propounded; for Uncertainty is a Nullity; what is uncertain can come under no Definition, for while it is uncertain, whether any Object is black or white, it is neither black or white to the Eye that views it.

I do

I do not scruple to grant, that God may convey his Will by a Tradition, with the above-mentioned Marks, but that he has so done, is another Question that follows not from the Premises laid down; to know whether he has or not, must be by examining the Facts, and more particularly, to know whether the Institutions are appointed by God, which is essentially necessary in this Case, otherwise it may be only a Human Law, or a Trick.

For Example, the Institution of the Passover, if a Miracle had not attended it, to which the People were Witnesses, might have been possibly a Trick of *Moses*, and no divine Appointment.

Therefore Divine Laws must be attended with Evidence, that they come from God, otherwise they are nevertheless no Divine Laws to us.

I grant, that the Abolition of the Sabbath, and the Institution in its Stead of the Lord's Day, is a Divine Law, though not recorded in the sacred Writ as such, because, though the Lord's Day is transiently mentioned there, it is so naked of Circumstances, that it is by no Means propounded as a Law: However, I dare bring it to the Test of the four Marks. For,

1. As the Observation of either the one or of the other, was publickly attended with a thousand Circumstances, they both were the Objects of Mens outward Senses, their Eyes and their Ears; it was impossible therefore that the Observation of the *Jewish* Sabbath could cease without the Eyes and Ears of Men, had

had been Witnesses thereto, or that the Lord's Day could have been instituted without the same Evidence.

2. The Observation of so great a Festival as either one or the other, could be no otherwise than publick.

3. Their Kalendars, and the Service performed on those Days, are publick Monuments and Actions kept up in Memory of the Fact.

4. Such Monuments and Actions could commence no otherwise than from the time in which the Fact was done, because the Abolition of the Service could not be before the Observation of the Day was abolished; because it was instantaneous, and attended the Day, the Expiration of the Day must necessarily attend the Abolition of the Service. As to the Lord's Day, the publick religious Service must take its Rise from the publick Institution of the Day, because the Observation of the Day requires to be attended with a Service.

For Example, if an Act of Parliament should decree, that *Sunday* be abolished with its Service, and *Monday* be observed in its Stead with new Prayers, &c. and the Clergy, out of their usual Complaisance in such Case, should universally submit thereto, this could not be done without having the Senses of a whole Nation Witnesses thereto; and Posterity might easily know when such a Fact was done, if they could fix seven Days before immediately preceeding in which it was not done.

Thus far is satisfactory to prove it a Church Act, and that it was an Apostolical Act will more plainly appear.

This must be done when the Church was Govern'd by one common Power, whose Decrees could immediately spread and require unanimous Obedience, for otherwise the Practice would not have been uniform; the Churches would have had different Customs, as about the Observation of *Easter*.

Immediately after the Apostles Days, Christianity spread over the World; such a Decree therefore could not have been passed without a general Council, of whose Sessions it is as impossible there should be a Silence in Ecclesiastical History, as that all the Bishops in *Europe* should meet in a general Council at this Day, and our own Historians record nothing of the Matter.

Here, dear Doctor, is moral Evidence; it is no Shame for the Scripture to go Hand in Hand with it; not to omit, that the mention of the Lord's Day in the Scriptures, compared with succeeding Practice, is an Evidence which carries up this Alteration very high; nor do I desire a more strong Proof for any Matter of Fact in the World.

Thus, dear Doctor, we tread upon firm Ground, but when I shall bring your Essentials to this Test, they will moulder like the Apples of *Sodom*; they appear fair and beautiful to the Eye, but in Taste are very Ashes.

Another Question arises, whether, though all Divine Laws are not so evidently propounded
in

in Scripture, as to keep their Ground without Tradition, the Scriptures do not contain, by Inference or otherwise, all that is required to be believed, in Relation to the Christian Religion?

To this I answer, that though God is not bound up to reveal his Laws, purely in that Manner, nevertheless in Fact there is no Article of Faith, nothing necessary to Salvation, which is not contained in Scripture, or inferred therefrom.

If your Friends can mention one, which at the same time will bear the Test of the four Marks, I shall acknowledge my self mistaken.

But, dear Doctor, with all the Respect to your Learning and Merit, your Instance of the divine Right of Episcopacy will not serve the Turn, as I shall shew more fully in my Answer to a *Scotch* Presbyterian, pretended Minister of *Dumbarton*, when it sees the Light. I have there also, dear Doctor, brought the *Ignatian* Epistles to the Test of Tradition, in which I have found Success equal to my Expectations.

These are my Bounds I have set to my own Territories, which I design to maintain, even against all Force, except the irresistible Torrent of clear and unbiaſſed Reason; but, however, having settled Peace in my own Frontiers, I begin, according to the Custom of Potentates, to cast my Eyes upon my Neighbours Possessions; I find an Heat in my Breast to enlarge my Conquests; and take in your

Field of Controversy, dear Doctor, and make it my own, which I shall reserve for the succeeding Chapter.

CHAP. V.

Dr. Brett's Notion of Tradition considered, as delivered in his late Book, called, A farther Proof for Tradition, and compared with what has been already laid down.

AS No Man is obliged by Statute or Common Law to give a Reason for what he says, except he is called in Question for the same, you, dear Sir, out of your abundant Goodness, have, without any Demand on our Side, given a very good Reason for your writing this Vindication of your Postscript. You tell us, you only maintained the Truth in your Postscript, that all the learned Author has said, by way of Reply, has not really invalidated any one thing you have there endeavoured to maintain; and therefore you thought it proper to make the Rejoinder.

Now, as, in my Opinion, a Rejoinder is Backing and Supporting what has been said before, if the learned Author had invalidated what you had there said, the Rejoinder would have been only a Support to Falshood and Error. And if, on the other Side, he had invalidated

lidated nothing you had said, there had been Occasion for no Rejoinder at all, no more than a new, firm and strong House can have Occasion for a great Piece of Timber to be set up to keep it from falling.

If the learned Author argues after your Method, he can do no less than write a Rejoinder to your Rejoinder, and so on even to your Successor, till a final End is put thereto before a Court which over-rules all Rejoinders, and finishes all Controversies, both Ecclesiastical and Civil, in the World.

To proceed, Reverend Sir, to your third Paper, you take Offence where you have no such Cause for Quarrel.

The *No Reasons*, you say, owns Tradition to be of great Use, when it is truly primitive, for explaining Scripture: The *No Sufficient Reasons*, you say, does not deny Tradition may be of Use: And the *No Just Grounds* comes, you complain, lower yet, and does not deny Tradition its proper Use.

By Tradition, as I take it, is here meant only the Testimony of the first Ages. Now, what Offence it can be to you, that the Opinion of the first Ages is of Use to explain Scripture, I protest, is beyond my Power to tell; because it is what you have constantly argued for, and is as modest an Account thereof as can be desir'd.

But to you, learned Sir, it seems too modest; you are for weakning the Force of the Scriptures, by making Tradition absolutely
necessa-

necessary to explain them. But I advise you candidly, to take Care of tampering too much with that Foundation, because it may bring the Ruins of Christianity about your Ears. I would not have you speak more contemptibly of the Scriptures than is consistent even with the Credit of our Statute-Book; for no Lawyer would be angry if I should say, that Custom is of great Use to explain some Acts of Parliament, which by Length of Time are made difficult to be understood.

But he would think me mad, if I should say Custom is absolutely necessary to explain every Act of Parliament contained in the Statute-Book; whereas I am satisfied there are many very easily to be explain'd by their own Sense they carry in their Front.

Can the learned Doctor perswade either himself or me, that God made the Scripture up into Knots, on Purpose for the Fathers to untie, who were often very happy in that Work when they set about it? The Millennarian Opinion was the Daughter of such Tradition, and so was the communicating Infants: And that Angels who were called the Sons of God, *Gen. vi.* came down, and had carnal Copulation with Women, which is the Whimsy of *Justin Martyr*. Or, what shall we say of * *Tertullian*, who could elude that plain Text, *Mat x. 12.* *But when they persecute you in this City, flee into another;* and makes it concern

* *Tertull. de Fug. in Persecutione.*

only the Apostles: And at the same time knocks all he said before on the Head?

I do not speak this by way of Reflection, but only to shew, that Tradition may sometimes be of great Use, and sometimes not: And your Adversary bestows as high a Compliment thereon as it would bear.

Moreover, you are displeased the *No Sufficient Reason* says, Tradition may be of Use. This is diminishing its Credit, because it takes away the Necessity; so that still the Scriptures seem rather to be made for Tradition, than Tradition for the Scriptures.

But you complain more heavily of the *No Just Grounds*, that it does not deny Tradition its proper Use. What, would you have it assume more than its Use? Must it be advanc'd into an Usurper, to turn the Scriptures out of their ancient Possession they have held by Prescription, to be at least the Word of God. And if God cannot write as clearly as he can speak, or at least write as clearly as Man can speak after him, it is very hard. Indeed, learned Sir, I have a greater Notion of the Divine Being, than to imagine, that he either cannot write or dictate clearly, or will not, when the Nature of the Thing requires it.

As to your 4th Page, you contend with the learned Author, that he says, all things necessary to Salvation are contained in Scripture; this I have already asserted, and shall not retract that Assertion, till you bring one Article
of

of Faith, not in the Scripture, which will stand the Test of the four Marks.

But if, learned Sir, you can produce any one Instance, where our blessed Saviour mentions Tradition, otherwise than by way of Reflection, I will give up the Cause; he recommended the Scriptures to his Disciples, but, you say, when our Lord recommended this Rule to his Disciples, there were no Scriptures except the Old Testament, which is more than you can prove; for, undoubtedly, his Sermon upon the Mount was penned as it was delivered, which contained as many new Doctrines as were necessary 'till the farther Progress of his Ministry.

That the Scriptures of the Old Testament are a Rule, as well as the New *i. e.* That they contain the Law of God, and such Laws as concern us, cannot well be denied, by your learned Body, even though they declare open Hostilities against the fourth Commandment.

That the *Bereans* were commanded to search the Scriptures of the Old Testament, I do not think worth denying; but why God should chuse to speak more plainly in the Old than in the New, I leave to your judicious self to determine; for my Part, I ever thought, even the most intricate of *St. Paul's* Epistles more intelligible than *Daniel*.

I hope, learned Sir, you will excuse my Impertinence, if I desire Leave to inquire into your Syllogism, drawn up in the 6th Page, because I was put out of Commons for making such an one, when I was at *Cambridge*; it runs thus.

What

What our Lord prescribed to his Disciples as the Rule of Salvation, is the only Rule of Salvation.

But our Lord prescribed the Scriptures of the Old Testament, not the Scriptures of the New Testament, for the Rule of Salvation.

Therefore the Scriptures of the Old, and not the Scriptures of the New, are the only Rule of Salvation.

The like Syllogism, as to Sense, is this: What such an Horse cost *A. B.* in *May* last must be the only Price of the Horse now; but such was the Price of the Horse in *May* last;

Ergo, Such is the Price of the Horse now.

It's my Opinion, the Consequence of the *Major* may very safely be denied here, because Horses are not of an established Price by Act of Parliament.

Moreover, learned Sir, I desire you to consider, that what our Saviour prescribed to his Disciples at that time, might be the only Rule of Salvation to them, till more was discovered; for my Part, I thought it very hard for a Man to have an uncertain Rule of Faith; but I think it much worse to have a Rule of Faith before it is formed; as I think it pretty difficult to conceive how a Man can be called a Father before his Children are born.

This was no Consequence of the learned Author's, but of your own; because all that he laid down, was, that the Scriptures then in Being, were the Rule to his Disciples at that time; but your learned self has changed the Terms

D

of

of the Question, and made a Paralogism instead of a Syllogism.

If you please to look nearer into your *Major*, you will find one Term too many; for the Consequence supposes two Terms therein, the Rule of Salvation to his Disciples, and the Rule of Salvation to us.

I shall forbear criticising any farther, because I consider I have got a Man otherwise great in my Hands, and, moreover, an old Friend, whom it would be barbarous to squeeze to Death; let me only add, dear Sir, that I wonder you insist so strenuously upon the Old Testament in this Case, being the only written Rule then extant; because Additions do not alter the Nature of the Rule, any more than the new Statutes added to *Keble's* Collections, make his cease to be a Rule of Statute-Law to us; as the extending an old Way in Length with Pick-axes and Shovels, does not destroy, but enlarge it.

You are pleased, Sir, to alledge, in your own Favour, two Citations from two very great Men in our Church; if Modesty will permit, I will venture to pass my Word that they are nothing to your Purpose.

What your Party generally understand by Tradition in this Controversy, is no more than the scattered Opinion of one or two Fathers, at a vast Distance from each other; this, with great Gravity, you stile the universal Opinion of the Catholick Church, though, perhaps, you do not even understand the Passages your selves.

As

As for Dr. *Hammond*, he comes not even within your Reach, for you plead for the absolute Necessity of your Tradition, and give it a superior Authority to the Scriptures; he says, *The Scriptures are the more faithful and steady Way of Conveyance; and, for want thereof, many things may possibly have perished, or been changed by the Passage through so many Hands.* You allow any precarious Tradition, he supposes *the Christian to be equally secured of the Conveyance, that as one is Apostolical Writing, so the other is Apostolical Tradition.* This is the Tradition for which I contend, and if it comes to the same Clearness of Proof as the Scriptures, it must have the four Marks, to which, I am sure, not one of your Essentials (as you are pleased to call them) can pretend.

Neither does Dr. *Hammond* say, that all things necessary to Salvation are not in the Scriptures, so far is he from rendering Tradition absolutely necessary to supply the Defects of Holy Writ; nor does he positively assert, that there is any such thing in the World as oral Tradition of Articles of Faith; he only lays it down for granted to give even his Adversary, the Papist, all the Scope he could fairly demand.

As to Mr. *Thorndike*, he says, God never intended to declare in the Scriptures whatsoever is necessary to Salvation, clearly to all Understandings; so that he only makes Tradition the Explainer, not Repository of Articles of Faith: His Question is, whether the Scripture ends all Controversies concerning things necessary to

Salvation? which he answers in the Negative. but he no where asserts, that the Scriptures are defective as to Articles of Faith, tho' they may not be so clear and intelligible to every Man alike; and therefore Mr. *Thorndike* allows the Church to have Authority in this Case, and and what she universally believes, to be the Tradition of the Apostles.

Can any thing here said make for Articles of which in the Scriptures there is not the least Mention made, nor even Hint to help the Fancy to conjecture by.

After having premised this, I profess my Veneration for so great and so good a Man as your self, flies before Astonishment at the viewing your Contents, because, with your Pardon, dear Sir, they are utterly false. Your Head is this. *No new Thing for Members of the Church of England to say, That the Will of God is convey'd by Tradition, and not by Scripture.* Dr. Hammond asserted this, and Mr. Thorndike. Whether this is not a false Quotation, let the Reader judge.

I beg the Favour to be heard upon this Point a little farther, if your Cause, dear Sir, is the Cause of God and of Religion; if the eternal Happiness or Misery of Man depends thereon, and Tradition is your Rule of Faith; do you imagine that God has not even made his Laws so plain, as not to require the Support of unfair Dealing?

Can there be any Crime in human Society, of a worse Nature, than false Quotations? A
Man

Man had better be robb'd of his Goods, nay, even of his Wife, than his Sense. A Rape upon the Understanding, is, in my Opinion, the most barbarous of all Rapes.

Not only the Living, but the Dead have an Action in this Case; for it is very hard, when Men have toil'd for a Reputation here, and leave the World in pretty tolerable Terms, to lose the Fruit of their Labours when they are dead, without any previous Act of their own. The Sexton who takes their Rings from their Fingers, and their Shrouds from their cold Limbs, is a kinder Friend of the two.

To leave this ungrateful Subject, I shall proceed to your 16th Page, in which you display Dr. *Hammod's* Arguments, which are nothing to your Purpose. No one denies the Truths the Apostles utter'd, to be the Word of God, before they were set down in the sacred Writ; but the Evidence is our main Contest, and we differ very widely in that Point.

The farther I proceed, my Astonishment still encreases upon me. You seem not only to have robb'd the Dead, but your self likewise; for surely the learned, the judicious Dr. *Brett*, *Sacra Infula dignus*, would not, in his right Senses utter such an Expression as this, in your 17th Page, where you say, Mr. *Thorn-dike* does not undertake directly to shew, *That what is not taught at all either clearly or but obscurely, in the Scriptures, may be necessary to Salvation.* I desire you, dear Sir, directly to shew, how a Thing can be taught

taught not at all clearly or obscurely in the Scriptures. That some Things may not be written at all clearly, I know by some Experience of your Writings, tho' indeed this Passage is not so clear as it ought to be.

You proceed along with * *Mr. Thorndike*, whom you have taken into your Company, to prove what no body ever denied, *viz.* That the whole Rule of Faith is not in one particular Book or Chapter, but in the whole diffus'd. In this Particular you are indeed pretty clear, and, what is more than ordinary, much in the right; though you might have spar'd the Labour of lighting a Candle to the Sun.

Moreover, dear Sir, you Confess your self, that *Mr. Thorndike* denies that the Apostles taught any thing as necessary to be believed or practised, which they did not put in Writing, in some Part or other of the New Testament.

Nevertheless, when I compare this with the Title in your Contents above-mentioned, surely, says I, Learning takes its Flight, like Swallows before Winter; the Doctor wrote this when the Spirit was not upon him; he seems here weak like other Men.

Neither, dear Sir, could I help smiling at your 18th Page. The Connection of your Argument, and your Weight of Reason, were both admirable Proofs of your former Assertion, that Good Sense comes upon us by Fits and Starts. The Sum of your Argument is

* *Mr. Thorndike*, p. 18.

this. No Text of Scripture entails this peculiar Privilege upon the Scripture, to be the compleat Rule of Faith; therefore all Things necessary to Salvation are not contain'd therein: Consequently Tradition is not our Rule of Faith.

This Argument must necessarily be sharp, because it cuts its Master that made it, in the following Manner.

No particular Text of Scripture entails this Privilege upon Tradition, that it is to be the Rule of Christian Faith; therefore the Scriptures, and not Tradition, must be our Rule of Faith.

I am sure this Proof is as good on one Side as the other; if one has a wretched Consequence, its Brother is equally defective.

For, cannot the Scripture contain all Things necessary to Salvation, without expressly saying all Things are contained therein? For, if no Article of Faith is promulged otherwise, in such a Manner as is essential to a Divine Law, the Implication is natural and easy.

I must confess, you have mangled Mr. *Thorn-dike* with too much Barbarity. * In the first Place, you make him say, that the Will of God is convey'd to us by Tradition, and not by Scripture. † In the second Place, he denies that the Apostles taught any thing as necessary to Salvation, not contain'd in Scripture. †* And in the Third, nothing hinders, but that

* See the Contents.

† See p. 17. 18.

†* See p. 20.
some

some things may have been taught by the Apostles as necessary to Salvation, of which there is no mention in the Scripture.

I cannot very well excuse the Freedom you take with this excellent good Man; he never expected to have his Ashes disturbed so many Years since his first Repose, by the Effentialists; nor his Ghost brought upon the publick Stage of the World, to out-face the Church of *England*, of which he was ever a most steady Admirer.

Again, in your 21st Page you tear him from his beloved Retreats, from the Horrors of the present Age, to say what was never in his Thoughts, by your own Confession before, *viz. That the Scripture no where pretends to have taught all things necessary to Salvation.*

I only conjure you, by the solemnest Ties of Christianity to consider, whether either Truth or Falshood can be beholding to such a Patron. Truth wants no such Advocates, and Falshood hates a bare-faced Defender that tears the Paint from her Face, and discovers her in all her naked Deformity.

You surely, Sir, may be sensible, that if the Scripture teaches us all things necessary to Salvation, she pretends to what she teaches; and that all things necessary to Salvation are contained therein, you confessed in your 17th Page, was Mr. *Thorndike's* Assertion.

In short, all Mr. *Thorndike* meant, was no more than that Revelation might possibly be conveyed to us by other Means than Scripture, if
God

God pleased so to do, which is no more than I have already granted in this Treatise, though I can see no Advantage your Party can reap from hence.

Your 22d Page presented to my View, a most egregious Mistake of yours, another Flight from Common Sense.

Notwithstanding you had before elevated Tradition above Scripture, you say here, that how much soever it is a Law to the Church, it must yield to Scripture; and that Tradition can be no Law to the Church, if it contradicts the Scripture.

That is to say, how much soever it is a Law, it may be no Law: In the second Place, here is a gross Contradiction; that it may be how much soever a Law to us, is to say, it may be the highest Law to us, and at the same time an inferior Law to Scripture, which is undoubtedly a Law to us also. You are pleased here, Sir, to utter the most gross and flat Inconsistency that ever fell from a learned Pen.

Moreover, how one Divine Law can be superior to another in the same Respect, I do not understand: For, if Tradition is a Rule of Faith, it must be a Divine Law; that is, it must be constituted a Rule of Faith by God; it is absurd, that any Human Power can constitute a Rule for Divine Laws; this would make strange Havock in a Christian Society.

To conclude, dear Sir, you have weakened the Foundations of your own System, built up by unskilful Hands, and cemented with untem-

per'd Mortar : How long such a Pile may stand, and endure the Teeth of Time, we may conjecture from our modern Buildings about London.

To prove this Charge, if you make Tradition a Rule of Faith, and, at the same time, suffer it to yield and give way, the Faith must tumble with it. It is impossible there can be any Certainty in an uncertain Rule; and an uncertain Rule produces an uncertain Faith, and uncertain Faith brings uncertain Salvation upon us: All very hopeful Circumstances for those who have any tender Breathings after the Joys of Heaven.

After all this great, this glorious Tradition, that sometimes is magnified so much, is here dwindled into Custom; but as you are pleased, dear Sir, to give me this kind Hint to proceed upon, I shall examine your Parallel between *English* Custom and Tradition.

The Foundation of Custom in our *English* Laws, is upon either of these two Maxims, *Quod non Apparet non est*, or *Quod Apparet est*. As to the first; if a Man enjoys, without Claim, the Use of a Common, it is presumed to be his; for, as no Right appears against him, it is supposed none can appear.

As to the second; if a Man's Pretensions, or the Judgment of a Court have been determined in his Favour, that Judgment is recorded, which Evidence appears to future Ages, both in his Behalf, or of any other Person who has the like Pretensions: This is the Whole of the Common Law of England.

Your

Your Tradition can be only concerned with the first, because Records are written Testimonies, and may be called State-Scripture.

Nor can your Notions have any thing to do with the first, because you are so far from having immemorial Time on your Side, that your very Principles are within Infants Remembrance; if you pretend that the Revival is new, your Points have still the Advantage of Prescription in the primitive Times. I answer, if a Man should enter upon an Estate, and pretend to keep it, because some of his Family had Possession of the same 400 Years ago, his Plea would be very absurd, for Custom allows no Gaps.

Whereas, alas, your Custom has a very wide Chasm; Custom therefore has no Affinity with your Tradition. This I thought fit to premise, because you are justly stiled D. L. L. The Statute-Law can over-rule the Common Law; but, to say, that Tradition is the Law of God, and that Scripture can over-rule that Tradition, is the same as to say, God is not very consistent in his Laws; for, to fix such precarious Essentials, is setting Traps for Mens Souls, an Employ below the Dignity of the supream Power of the Universe.

But why, dear Sir, do you hang upon Dr. *Hammond* and Mr. *Thorndike* again? I shaked them from your Sleeve before: I gave them a Deliverance from your cruel Treatment, though P. 25, you fly at them with no Manner of Ceremony again.

In short, dear Sir, they are not yours, nor will they ever be yours: You are in no fair Way of making any Converts on the other Side the Grave; you may send your Plenipo's to those Regions, they will not come into your Alliance; they are too happy to engage in your unnatural Broils below.

Well, dear Sir, to let these Gentlemen alone, I shall turn to your 28th Page, in which you are pleased to prove, in your Way, from Scripture, an Hypothesis, I am afraid, you are bound to defend at all Hazards.

You have granted, that Traditions suppose every thing the Apostles delivered by Word, or by Epistles; and this is indeed evident from the Apostle's own Words, *2 Thess. ii. 15. Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or by our epistle.*

No Man, who pretends to believe the Christian Religion, will scruple to grant the Apostles Doctrines, whether delivered from the Pulpit, or written in their Epistles, were the Word of God: But, however, this does not prove the Apostles uttered Articles of Faith, which afterwards were not penn'd down; or, that these Instructions, personally delivered to their Audience, were a separate Body of Commands ordained to be transmitted, by Word of Mouth, to future Ages, because there is no such Transition mentioned in all the Scripture, from the Person to whom they were first delivered, to others afterwards; without which, all these pretended

tended Proofs from Scripture are to no Purpose; for no Man doubts, who has common Sense, that what the Apostles delivered, while they were alive, and present to explain their own Instructions, might very safely be retain'd in the Memory, and observ'd.

But does it follow from thence, that the Scripture may not be a safe and secure Conveyance of the Divine Will to those who were not blessed with the happy Instructions of those Saints when alive? Had we such Lanterns to our Paths in these Days, some of our old Friends would be asham'd to follow an *Ignis fatuus*, for so I term an upstart Meteor, whose Birth is easily remembered, and whose Appearance is only in the Dark.

I hope you will not take what I here say as a personal Affront upon your self: I speak in relation to this new Light, which dar'd not stand the Reformation, nor look our Bishops thirty Years ago in the Face, nor those deprived since the Revolution; but shews its pale Glimmerings, when a total Eclipse over-darkens the Steps of our Pastors, and robs us of the Light and Glory of a Triumphant Church.

If this *Ignis fatuus* leads your Party out of the Way, and makes them wander in the wild Paths of Error and Confusion, you may, when the Sun arises in the Morn, be sensible of your pretty Dance.

I am confident it has led you upon a most fatal Mistake, in granting, that Tradition may stand in Competition with Scripture, and prove
too

too weak: Consequently, if it may contradict Scripture, it may by the same Reason convey a Falsity to the World; and consequently, your Traditional Essentials may be no better. And if so, why so positive, good Sir? For what may be a Falshood, cannot be called a Truth, in respect of us, whom you bring in God to damn for not knowing more than we can know.

You are pleased to say, p. 31, that your Articles cannot be contrary to Scripture, because nothing in Opposition to it is contain'd therein; consequently, they cannot be said to interfere with Scripture.

If I can rationally demonstrate, that they both may and do interfere with Scripture, you are driven from your grand Refuge, and must be forc'd to take Winter Quarters, like the *Marquis de Lede* in *Sicily*, without one fortified Town for your Retreat.

As the Evangelists, taken all together, are supposed to record the most material Passages of our Saviour's Life, his Death and Resurrection: As the *Acts of the Apostles* contain in a great measure the Travels of that Great Apostle *St. Paul*: As his Epistles are numerous, and at different Times sent to the chief Churches where he planted his Gospel; and nevertheless all these are silent concerning the most material Points of Religion; is, in my Opinion, interfering with Scripture: For if they tend to destroy the Authority of the Scripture, to make the Gospels inaccurate Histories, and *St. Paul* a careless Apostle, this is, in my Opinion, meddling

meddling with the Scripture too freely, with your Pardon.

I say it is scarcely probable, that particularly Prayers for the Dead should find no Place in the New Testament, no more than in the Old.

That even the Lord's Prayer, which has an intercessory Petition for our Enemies, should have none for the Dead, is pretty unaccountable alone; but that we have no Footsteps any where else, is more wonderful still.

That the *Sadducees* could not be satisfied of our Saviour's constant Method of Praying for the Dead, when they came to ask insnaring Questions concerning the Resurrection, is at least a Probability against your Opinion.

That our blessed Saviour, in his Prayer to his Father for his Disciples, and those who were afterwards to believe on him; should mention not one Word of the Departed, is really an Omission, taken with the rest, pretty singular in its Nature.

There are such high Marks of Probability from a Collation of so many Passages in Scripture, that nothing can more derogate from it, either as an History, or as a Revelation of a future State, than the imaginary Omission of such Prayers.

If I should say, my Lord *Herbert*, in his History of *Henry VIII.* made no Mention of the Divorce of his Queen *Katharine*, a Passage so material, it would be a Derogation from that History; nay, it would interfere therewith, because

because it cannot be imagined such an important Relation could escape Notice.

May I not argue against the Pope's Supremacy in the same Manner? May I not say it interferes with Scripture, because it interferes with the Verity, Niceness and Exactness of the sacred Writ, to mention so many Particulars of our Saviour's Life, and omit so grand a Devolution of Power at his Death?

I may therefore safely assert, you interfere with Scripture; you make it a poor, lame and defective Account.

If you demand, how I prove all things necessary to Salvation are contained in Scripture; I answer, that it follows very consequentially, if no Articles of Faith are revealed to us another Way, which cannot be, unless they have that necessary Evidence of their being revealed to justify our Acquiescence therein: As to the Matter of Fact, I shall speak hereafter, in the mean time, I positively assert, there are no such extant.

The Conclusion of your 34th Page, I am afraid, interferes both with good Sense, and somewhat you have laid down before: The Words are, *And therefore as to the literal Sense of Scripture, where it seems plain, easy and natural, I am always for making it so, except some very plain Reason, such as the constant Tradition of the Church interposes, why I should not understand it so.* Whereas before, Tradition was to bend to Scripture, now Scripture is to bend to Tradition; for, how can it be otherwise,
 wise,

wise, if it over-rules the plain, easy and natural Sense thereof; greater Dominion can never be claimed over Writings.

For surely, nothing can over-rule the plain, easy and natural Sense of a Writing, otherwise than by cancelling or contradicting the same.

The Holy Scriptures have suffered very severely under this Discipline; for, if where they have their plain, easy and natural Sense, they are to be otherwise understood, they are upon the same Foot with the *Delpbick* Oracles: A very righteous and just System of Laws they are, by this time, made.

They must, in this Case, either actually utter a Falshood, or frame another Ambiguity, artfully contrived on purpose to bear two plain, easy and natural Senses; a Way of deceiving Mankind none take, except the Devil and his Agents.

For, if the Sense is plain, natural and easy, the Interpretation, at least, ought to be equally clear, or else it is worse than a *Dutch* Comment. *Ibis, redibis, nunquam per Bella peribis*, is just such Scripture as this would make.

But if the Sense must bear an Interpretation more clear than the plain, easy and natural Sense, this is, indeed, lighting a Candle to the Sun; plain, easy and natural Sense requires no Comment, nor the Help of Tradition.

But if the Interpretation must be less clear than the plain, easy and natural, we are infinitely obliged to you, dear Sir, for an Hypothesis so favourable, to give Tradition the Pri-
F
vilege

vilege to darken and obscure plain, easy and natural Sense.

Mr. Deacon's Hypothesis comes on the Stage next; a very pretty one, and worthy of his Years, but hardly worthy of your noble self to defend; in short, it is this:

Our blessed Saviour having washed his Disciples Feet, *said to them, ye ought also to wash one anothers feet, for I have given you an example that ye should do as I have done to you.* I suppose you would infer from hence,

1st. That this Text has a plain, easy and natural Sense; why then, I think, it is very hard it is not understood, because plain, easy and natural Sense every Man can command, who has the Power over any Sense at all. But, I beg of you, dear Sir, to consider how an Allegory can be said to carry a plain, easy and natural Sense, not by construing it literally, but allegorically, as it ought: Where our blessed Saviour says, *I am the Vine*, taken literally, would be far from plain, easy and natural Sense; but allegorically the Sense is as easy as any Man can desire: But if it is disputable, whether an Expression in an allegorical or literal Way, is not plain, easy and natural Sense, this is, dear Sir, contrary to your Hypothesis: There is a wide Difference between plain and grammatical Construction, and the Sense to be put upon that Construction.

If the Sense of that Text is plain, easy and natural, why is there any Dispute concerning the same? But if not, what is it to your Purpose?

pose? Your Endeavour was to prove, that the Scripture could not subsist with an uncertain Tradition, without Falshood to support it.

2dly. Though it is plain, easy and natural, it cannot be understood without Tradition. I pray, dear Sir, what has Tradition done to explain it? Has Tradition proved, that it should not be taken in a literal Sense? Our Saviour refused to give the Reason of his so doing, till another Opportunity. Has Tradition informed us when that Opportunity happened, and what our Lord said upon that Occasion? Perhaps he who ever endeavoured to keep up with his Apostles, the Notion of Equality, made this a positive Precept for them alone to observe: Has Tradition determined the contrary? What Light therefore has Tradition brought upon this Text?

O say you, what Evidence have we except from Tradition, that this Precept was not upon the same Foot with the Celebration of the Eucharist?

I will tell you, dear Sir, the abundant Difference.

The Circumstances of each Action are to be considered.

The Solemnity and Preparation for the blessed Eucharist shews alone, that it was not designed to be an Allegory.

Moreover, our blessed Saviour took the Bread, and blessed it, which could not be Allegorical, because, generally, Blessings and Prayers are in earnest.

Besides, he actually took the Elements, he brake the Bread, and delivered the Cup to drink to all, without Exception, and commanded them to do it in Remembrance of him. Now the Remembrance of a departed Friend is the dearest and most solemn Charge in the World. There is no allegorizing in these grand Concerns, nor is there any Doubt but that the Apostles took all the Action in a literal Sense for their Imitation; they asked no Questions what he meant, as they did before.

An Allegory, dear Friend, has generally some Symbols attending the same, very obvious to the meanest Understandings, otherwise they would be no longer Allegories, but Riddles; Washing of Feet is a plain, easy and natural Symbol of Humility.

But in the other here was not only the Action performed, but the Reason for the same, to keep up the Remembrance of a departed Friend; and, we all know, such Remembrances ought to continue while Friends remain alive to commemorate the Departure; nor is it possible but that Christ will have Friends below in his Church, to the End of the World, though he has so many Enemies in their Cloathing.

I hope, by this time, you will please to return Mr. *Deacon* his Argument again; the worse for a little wearing, as things generally are that are slight.

But, I pray, dear Doctor, why so soon offended with your self? At the Conclusion of your fine new Argument you have changed the
Terms

Terms of your Question: Before, it was plain, easy, and natural Sense; now, is *p. 37.* seemingly plain and easy? Upon my Word, I renounce this Bite, I will not allow this Changing of Terms, the Question shall stand as before: That plain, easy, and natural Sense, to make it more plain and obvious, must be explain'd by something more obscure than it is in it self.

You are pleased to say, and consequently, to defend what you say, right or wrong, That Scripture and universal Tradition are always on one Side; I pray, Sir, have you got one Tradition in your Pocket, and another on the Table? I desire to know, what Tradition is that which before was appointed to yield to Scripture? I am sure you call'd that Tradition your Rule of Faith, you argu'd for it upon that Bottom; and what you have done with it now, you ought best to tell.

You would perswade the World, that your learned and worthy Antagonist is a weak Arguer; for my Part, I do not believe it. At least, I am very confident he argues fairly, as he has no private Views, &c. but alone the naked Truth to defend, I will say no more, because I would not bear too hard.

The weak Argument is this, *viz.* No wonder, if that were all that were referr'd to before the New Testament was written. But this is no Evidence, that the whole Canon of Scripture was not still more to be depended upon when it was once settled and compleated.

You

You are pleased to infer from hence, that the Scriptures referr'd to by our blessed Saviour were not a sufficient Rule.

This Consequence does not follow as Consequences ought, from the Premises, because those Scriptures may be a sufficient Rule at one time, which require farther Enlargements to be so afterwards. The Celebration of the Eucharist was a Divine Law, after it was commanded; but surely the Apostles might have a sufficient Rule to walk by before that commenc'd a Law.

Is not *Keeble* a very good Rule of Statute-Law to those who liv'd as far as it goes? But may not Acts of Parliament enlarge that Rule for succeeding Ages?

Methinks, by your 39th Page, the Measures for the Campaign are alter'd, you have broke up your Siege, and seem to wish the Enemy would act upon the Offensive; you say, the learned Author ought to prove, that Tradition is not the Rule prescrib'd.

It was very kind to turn this Negative upon the learned Author's Hands; tho' I say, dear Sir, it is incumbent upon you to prove the Affirmative; because Rules of Faith must be established before they are taken for granted. You might as well assert Mother *Shipton's* Prophecy to be a Rule of Faith, and command the learned Author, with great Gravity, to prove Mother *Shipton's* Prophecy is not the Rule prescrib'd.

You

You are indeed the most steady and fast Friend to Tradition that ever wrote in its Defence. You advance its Interest as much as lies in your Power, and seem to have nothing in your View, but to make it great. This is like a faithful Minister of State, a perfect *Mazarine* or *Richlieu*.

Whereas, the learned Author insists, that Tradition might be kept in its due Bounds, and be allowed its proper Use, you grow furious. The *French* King would not be more enraged, to have a Parcel of little Princes prescribe Bounds to his Conquests; you seem to be perfectly jealous, lest a Plot should be form'd against the Absolute Power of Tradition.

Thus I earnestly beg you would not run on so fast; it was your self who set Bounds to Tradition; in this very Treatise you agreed, that upon a Contest it must yield to Scripture: But if that modest Concession was no more than a Sham, till your Argument could recruit its Strength, and bid Defiance to all its Enemies, this might be a very good Stratagem in Politicks, tho' a wretched one in Logick. For my Part, I sincerely profess unlimited Tradition is to me the same as unlimited Lying; for if you set no Bounds or Marks to know Tradition by, or to restrain it, its Territories are vast and wide, and take in the vast Realms of Ignorance and Falshood.

Besides, dear Sir, Tradition is not weakened in any of its just Pretensions, to say, That all Things necessary to Salvation are contain'd in Scripture,

Scripture, and may be inferr'd from thence, if Tradition has all its due Credibility conceded, the Dispute only turns upon Matter of Fact, which must be determin'd, by examining what Motives of Credibility your pretended Testimonies have.

I urge the moral Improbability, that any Article of Faith can be wholly omitted in the sacred Writ. The utter Silence of the four Evangelists concerning the Mixing Water with Wine, can be scarce excusable, if the very Action of Mixing was upon the same Foot with Breaking the Bread and Blessing it, or taking the Cup, and commanding them to drink thereof.

Moreover, for the Epistles occasionally penn'd to confirm some, and inform others, so unanimously to omit an Essential of Christianity, is at least hard to digest.

In my Opinion, the Fundamentals of Christianity lye in a very narrow Compass, and I can see them with one Cast of an Eye in the Scriptures. The numerous Divisions and Branches diffus'd over the Articles and Creeds of the various Sects of Christians at this Day, are either the supposititious Branches of Heresy and Superstition, or the natural and just Inferences from those few fundamental Points.

One Fundamental Point of Christianity is Obedience to its Laws; because, as no Society can subsist by Principles of Rebellion, so neither can any Power be conserved over the Lives and Consciences of Men, by Christ, if his
Laws

Laws are not obey'd : To maintain therefore that his Laws are not to be obey'd, is a fundamental Herefy.

The second fundamental Point is, That what is clearly and evidently reveal'd in Scripture, must be believ'd.

The third Fundamental, Our blessed Saviour's Mission, Death and Sufferings, as revealed, both according to his Nature, and to the Ends of that Grand Ministration.

These are the Fundamentals of Christianity, all the rest we believe or practise spring from hence.

From hence I can infer all the just Powers of Episcopacy, the Nature of Schism, the Unity of the Catholick Church ; and in short, all those Controversies that have arisen in the Christian World : From whence we may easily perceive, how the Fountains of Error have poisoned and infected even the living Conveyances of Truth.

As for any except these Fundamentals, they may be, and are essentially necessary, when they appear to be revealed : But to those to whom they do not appear revealed, they are not so, because there is no striking upon any Fundamental ; for, if we obey God's Laws as far as it is possible for us to know them, this is the Extent of what he requires from our Hands.

To propose therefore Laws in the Clouds, and to damn People for not seeing beyond their
G Reach,

Reach, is a very Tyrannical Notion of that Omnipotent Parent of the Universe.

I do not scruple to grant, that all his Laws essentially command Obedience, when they are sufficiently revealed as Laws ought to be.

Suppose your essential Points, as you are pleased to call 'em, were expressly injoin'd in the Scriptures, of which indeed there is not the least Sign or Mark; I demand, whether the disobeying them would be a greater Crime than the disobeying any other Command revealed therein?

I know your Answer will be this, That they have a peculiar Fundamentality in them, because, without those Points, there can be no Church. A Sacrament is destroyed in some, and a Schism with the Dead contracted by the rest.

As to what concerns, the vacating the Institution of the Eucharist, this must interfere with the third Fundamental, the End of our Saviour's Mission into the World; for then it consequentially follows, that our blessed Saviour came into the World, in order to establish the Sacrament of the Eucharist, consisting of the Elements of Bread, Water, and Wine, to be continually offer'd up as a representative Sacrifice of himself for the Sins of the World.

If so, is it strange the four Evangelists, whose Business it was jointly to transmit an Account of his Mission, should omit an essential Part thereof, the Water? Is it not more probable, if Water was mix'd, that it was omitted, as
not

not being a sacred, but an indifferent Action according to the Custom of the Country.

As to Prayers for the Dead, I protest I cannot see against what Fundamental the Omission of them can offend, because no Schism can happen without Rebellion either against Christ above, or his Ministers below; I cannot find what Dominion those middle State Powers ever have over us to require our Homage, nor that any Post has been settled between the other World and this to know their, or to communicate our Wants.

But if our blessed Saviour did come into the World to open such a Correspondence, and to command us to Pray for them, this would naturally fall in with several Places in Scripture, and have been at least treated upon by St. Paul, to enlarge the Idea of the Conquest over Death and the Grave.

Upon a View of what has been said, I hope this Conclusion follows, that Tradition must not spread its Empire over the Scriptures, which could never deserve the Name of Scriptures, if they could be so lame or imperfect as not to come up to the Exactness of prophane History, or even of Romances.

The Texts you are pleased to take from Scripture, P. 40, are nothing to your Purpose; *ἡ παράδοσις*, translated by you, Tradition, signifies any thing by Word of Mouth, or by Writing; so that these Traditions, on which you so eagerly insist, may still be written plain and easy Scripture, for ought you know to the contrary;

and, if so, they are cited to very little Purpose on your Side.

I cannot but observe a Fatality of your Party, to write too much in haste; such Inconsistencies fall so thick and so fast, as they give not even time for Breath: It was but just now you fell, with Fury, upon a learned Man, for limiting Tradition to its proper Use; and, presently after, upon calmer Thoughts, you confess Tradition may be abus'd. In short, this is a pretty Hypothesis, which can dilate or contract at the Author's Pleasure.

You are well assured *St. Paul* had Liturgies like your own, in his View, together with a whole *Farrago* of Essentials, in his second Epistle to *Timothy*: This is what he meant by commanding *Timothy* to hold fast the sound Form of Words which he heard. This is a Way of arguing so like the warm Productions of Mr. *Whiston's* Brain, that I really wonder you can imitate that unhappy Man: His Warmth brooding over this Chapter, has hatched the Apostolick Constitutions, and yours a Liturgy modelled after your own Fancy, though *Montanus* might have made them the same with his new Prophets, if he pleased.

Now, say you, what he heard from *St. Paul* must be from Word of Mouth, not in Writing: A little Wire-drawing more brings this Consequence, that what *St. Paul* delivered as personal Instruction to *Timothy*, could not be put in Writing any where else; whereas 'tis evident *St. Paul*, by the time this Epistle was wrote, as supposed

posed to be the last by your own Hypothesis, had all his Epistles communicated to the Churches; but whether he refers to what had never before been written, or to a Creed or Catechise to be learned *memoriter*, which might, however, contain new Articles of Faith, not written before; or whether it was a secular Will or Testament, or Instructions, concerning the Discipline of the Church, we are all in the Dark. The Papist is equally fond of this Text as your self, or the *Arian*: The Strength of Imagination works in every one to form something to himself.

However, dear Sir, religious Controversy is never to be determined by Strength of Imagination. There is no Appearance that the *Depositum*, or the sound Form of Words, were distinct Terms of Salvation, not even hinted at through the whole Scriptures. This Assumption is too much, it will not bear with the Sense of the Scripture, however, favourable it may seem to your Opinion.

What Occasion, say you, was there for *Timothy's* holding fast the sound Form of Words which he had heard, or committing them to faithful Men, if they were already, or afterwards, to be put in Writing; the same Inference may be made, if a Man was upon his Departure out of this World, after he had dictated his Will before his Executors, should press them to remember what he had so often told them, and exhort them, by the Bowels of Charity and Christianity, to put his Commands in Practice, that

that it follows the Will must not be penn'd down. *Timothy* had been often blessed with the oral Instruction of *St. Paul*; the Remembrance whereof strikes the Mind with more lively Sentiments of Veneration and Esteem, than Words penned down, told as they are written. However, you are very confident here is a plain Proof; something to be believed and practised was here hinted at, though this something to be believed and practised was not then to be put in Writing, nor afterwards.

You are pleased here to assume a Dictatorial Power over the Apostle's Words and Sense; for, without any Hint what this Form of sound Words was; without the least Mention of any thing to be believed or practised, you impose your own Notions, as if they had certainly been a Part of it, and were to be received accordingly.

The most the Words will bear, is, that as *St. Paul* had preached to *Timothy*, he should likewise instruct others, that the Sound of the Gospel might go to the Ends of the World.

What is more wonderful still, you have found out what this *Depositum* was, and to whom delivered; a Liturgy, with express Orders for mixing Water, Wine, &c. exactly the same with you: And, to make the Crack still louder, you conclude, *That where we find all Churches, from the Beginning, to have observed one common Form in the Sacraments, or the other Apostolical Ordinances, though we find nothing of that Form in Scripture, we may safely conclude, this was Part of that Depositum which was delivered*

vered by the Apostles to be handed down by Tradition. Indeed, honoured Friend, here is too much of the Gasconade, because no Liturgies so antient, in the first Place, are extant; and, secondly, it is very improbable, that there was in those Days an uniform, compleat Liturgy over the whole Christian World; for then the Observation of *Easter* would have been uniform likewise, which most certainly has a close Dependence upon a Liturgy.

If your new Form, dear Sir, is, in reality, the ancient Apostolical one retrieved, its Composition, I hope, would be agreeable to Apostolick Sense, to Apostolick Style, and to Apostolick Piety; for, it would be the highest Presumption to deviate one Scruple from that universal Uniformity established by such awful Authority.

The Defects of your new Form, in relation to common Sense, and the egregious Blunders therein, shew the Compilers either very negligent, very ignorant, or very indifferent; I leave to your Choice which of these three Characters you please to take, for all is too many at once.

This has been already shewed to my Hand, I hope therefore the Reader will excuse me from the Trouble of a Repetition.

Your Plea for the universal Practice of the primitive Church from the Liturgies, is lame and defective, because, in your Dissertation upon those Liturgies, you grant, that none, except the *Clementine*, were written before St.

Basil's

Basil's time ; and, as to the *Clementine*, I shall dispatch that in a few Words.

That in the third Century there was a Book called, *The Apostolick Constitutions*, I can easily grant ; that afterwards *Epiphanius* has given us an *Epitome* thereof is evident.

But we must observe *Epiphanius* informs us, that in his time Copies thereof went abroad corrupted by the Hereticks ; and thus the Matter slept till the 16th Century, and then up starts a Copy said to be found by *Ludovicus Capellus*, a *Venetian*, in the Isle of *Candia*, which the Papists immediately embrac'd, because *St. Peter* was there turned into a Lord ; and the whole Consistory of the Apostles seems to be a House of Peers.

No Wonder this took Effect in that Age, when the Struggle was more for Power than the Vitals of Religion.

But whether this Copy was from that which was orthodox and common in *Epiphanius's* time, or the Issue of that spurious one of which he complains ; or what Usage it received from the Hands of the Papists, are Particulars well worth inquiring after, and without their being fully known, this *Clementine* Liturgy is fit only to light the Doctor's Pipe.

Oh ! but you say, let it be interpolated, our Essentials are not Parts of the Interpolation. Dear Doctor, Mr. *Whiston* has been before you in this Argument ; he cries out immediately, when he is urged with the *Arianism* contained in those Constitutions, that such can be no Interpolation

terpolation, because that must be genuine, as it is consentient with the Doctrine of the primitive Church.

This is a Circle for you both to dance in, if you please. Fryar *Bacon* never made a more compleat one in his Life.

For, to prove the consentient Testimony of the Church from the *Clementine* Liturgy, and to prove the *Clementine* Liturgy from the consentient Testimony of the Church, is evidently a fatal Circle, I have marked it with my Chalk, and command you not to stir out of the same until you have solemnly recanted.

As Matters therefore stand, you have no Liturgy on your Side, before almost the 5th Century; how can such prove the universal Practice of the primitive Church in the Apostolick Age?

Indeed your Hypothesis, if it could be proved, would certainly end this Branch of the Controversy. You take it for granted the Apostles left a Liturgy to be learned by Heart, and, that these Liturgies are the same only differing in a few Words.

This is a naked Supposition in the first Place, and fixed upon a false Foundation in the second; you have no Proofs I observed before, more early than the 4th Century, at least. These therefore can only stand good for their own Times.

Then your Supposition is built upon another Supposition, no Man of Sense will grant, viz. That a Form of Words may be learned by Heart, from Generation to Generation, for
H many

many Ages, without even the Possibility of any considerable Variation; whereas common Experience will inform us, that even a Story shall get or lose in twice telling.

If you once allow the Possibility of these essential Variations, your whole Fabrick stoops to one common Ruine, because Uncertainty can never be the Conveyer of a Divine Law.

It is evident, the *Roman* Services made essential Variations in less than Four Hundred Years, after even these pure Liturgies of yours were penn'd: Nay, these essential Variations silently stole upon the Church, and grew up into gross and palpable Errors, without Contradiction, for some Ages. As for my Part, I am not such a blind Bigot to the preceding Ages, as not to think them fallible, when their Infirmities are the Subject of almost all Ecclesiastical History.

As for Mixing Water with Wine, in its due Place I can prove it was not the universal Practice or Opinion of the primitive Church, and your Prayers for the Dead, as essential as you make them, are not supported in such a Sense by your beloved Liturgies themselves.

You must necessarily suppose the Souls of the Departed to be in a State of Melioration, and that they receive, or are supposed to receive Benefit by such Prayers.

The *Clementine* Liturgy leaves you in the Lurch upon this Occasion. The Words are, *Farther we offer to thee for all the Saints who have pleas'd thee, from the Beginning of the World, &c.*

This

This is no more, in the first Place, than a Thanksgiving, as is ours in the Prayer for the Church Militant.

Secondly, This universal Prayer, if it is such, is for all the Saints who have been from the Beginning of the World.

It is absurd, that all the Saints from the Beginning of the World, should want our Prayers; even the *Romish* Purgatory holds not Souls so long as yours. Moreover, *Enoch* and *Elijah*, who were never there, will not thank you for your Prayers: And, I am sure, the Apostles, who are here expressly mention'd, are above 'em. Are you so vain as to imagine they want your Prayers? Have a Care of the Revelations. You may perhaps interfere with that Canonical Book of Scripture, which has actually plac'd a great Number of these Saints in Heaven.

Your Citation, dear Sir, from St. *James's* Liturgy, is so far from being a Prayer for the Dead, that it is a Prayer for the Living only, that they may find Mercy and Favour from God, as the Dead have done before. As to what follows afterwards, as it includes all the righteous Persons from *Abel* to that Day, I have the same Objection to offer here, as before, in relation to the *Clementine* Liturgy.

However, as you have been pleased to mention both these Liturgies, it puts a Thought into my Head not over agreeable to your Hypothesis.

St. James's Liturgy, tho' not penn'd till the fifth Century, you are confident, was the Liturgy delivered by St. James to the Presbyters of his Church.

At the same time you as positively make the *Clementine* Liturgy the Standard and Test for the rest. So that here are two *Sosio's*, thereof one must necessarily be a Pretender.

By this time, dear Sir, here is another Ruine coming about your Ears; for if one of these Liturgies proves to be spurious, and convey'd by a false Tradition, the rest of the Family will have spurious Titles, or at least yield very just Cause of Suspicion.

Thus is your fine Tradition, on which you build your Essentials, convicted of Imposture; yet upon a Trial by Tradition you have put your immortal Souls at the Last Day. How do my Bowels yern with Compassion for my Kinsmen in the Flesh, for my dear Companions with whom we went sweetly in the House of God together, till the Gall of Bitterness, and the Bond of Iniquity has destroy'd that most agreeable Harmony amongst us.

To return; I hope by this time you are convinc'd, that Tradition may help you to a Lie, as well as to a Truth; and if but one has crept in amongst your Essentials, in what an unhappy State are you plac'd?

I hope, Sir, your Goodness will pardon my Digression, because Truth call'd for it; I am now ready to speak once more concerning your Liturgick Prayers for the Dead. St. Mark's
Litur-

Liturgy runs on in the same Strain with the preceding, which are not Prayers for your Purpose; not to mention the Impropriety of praying for the Rest of those who are gone to Sleep, who dy'd in the Lord, and are pronounc'd to rest from their Labours. In short, I look upon all these Points to be Corruptions from the ancient Practice of Commemoration and Thanksgiving for Saints and Martyrs; who had laid down their Lives for Religion; of such a Commemoration by way of Gratitude for those bright and glorious Examples, I have no Reason to doubt, but your Schemes are of another Nature.

I observe, the Primitive Christians, in one Part of Policy (tho' Piety at the same time) imitated the *Roman* Government, by bestowing Favours on those who had signaliz'd themselves in their spiritual Warfare. Martyrs and Confessors in those Days made a glorious Figure in their Kalendars. If they dy'd, they departed with all the Comforts of Piety, Gratitude, and the Prayers of the Faithful; and if they survived, the Malice of their Enemies, and the Esteem naturally arising from Merit and Honour, made their Lives comfortable to them.

Commemorations of the Dead are as far from Prayers for them, as the Commemoration of the Martyrdom of King *Charles* is from being a Prayer for him.

Moreover, I observe, dear Sir, that in *St. James's* Liturgy, there are many blasphemous Epithets bestow'd upon the Virgin *Mary*. These,

These, you say, in your Dissertation thereon, were Additions afterwards, but yours were not. Thus is your infallible Conveyance become the Vehicle of Poison and Corruption; your dear Tradition has handed down some Lies, by your own Confession: And why your beloved Point may not be such, I have heard no Reason nor Argument, except what brings you into a Circle.

Well, Prejudice is ever certainly the most fatal Enemy to Conviction; for notwithstanding these strong Suspicions, and the Marks of Innovation which appear in every Line, you grant all this. But still your Points can be no such, because they are conformable to primitive Usage.

You may, if you please, still dance in this Circle; it has just Room enough for you and your little Church.

In short, not one of these Liturgies is free from the Marks of Forgery, Corruption, and Innovation. The Invocation of the blessed Virgin, you confess, is awkwardly brought into both the Liturgies of *St. James* and *St. Mark*; and yet these are Additions of no Moment.

Dear Sir, if you consider seriously, you will find you have levell'd all your own Works; for say you, tho' these Liturgies might be clean and neat at first, adapted to the Circumstances of an Apostolick Age; nevertheless some Additions crept in afterwards agreeable to the Times. Thus the Pope (whom you will have to be the Patriarch of *Alexandria*) is pray'd for by Name.

Men-

Mention is made of an orthodox King ; and the Words of Art assumed in the 4th and 5th Centuries, are placed in those Liturgies.

These Liturgies, you find, come to your Hands, but through what Kennels they have been dragged, you are utterly ignorant : Oblation and Invocation might creep in with, *Hail Mary, full of Grace.*

If these Liturgies are your Rule of Faith, you are very unfortunate therein ; for, if all the Marks of Novelty, Corruption, Popery and Interpolation, make not your Rule uncertain and precarious, I desire to know what will.

Your Standard is a ridiculous Imposture, nay, it is an Imposture upon an Imposture, patm'd upon us out of a Popish Monastery, after it has had their Corrections, Emendations, or whatever they pleased.

The succeeding are much worse ; Blasphemy, Heresy and Idolatry bring up the Rear, all hatched out of the Brains of Impostors, ignorant of Ecclesiastical History, of common Sense, or of common Modesty ; for these have been the inseparable Marks of all Impostors in former Ages : Thus we can easily trace their Lies, and brand them to Posterity.

This, dear Sir, is your Evidence for the universal Practice of the primitive Church ; this is your infallible Rule of Faith, the Criterion by which you judge of the Number of the Damned, by counting only your own Church saved.

If our Bible was not more clearly transmitted, it would not be a Rule of Faith to any, except yourselves; *Geoffery Monmouth* should be a more valuable History of the two.

I conclude, that your Liturgies can be no certain Evidence of the Practice of the primitive Church, and, consequently, no Rule of Faith, by the first Axiom, that it is essential to a Law, to be a Law to a Society, that it be sufficiently known.

Well, to return; these Liturgies are, by you, supposed to be uniform, Page 45, or, at least, to differ no more than the two different Copies of the Lord's Prayer.

I do not wonder that Translations from different Languages will produce a Difference in the Words; for I do not imagine, that Men were ever found to speak or write alike: If you suppose *St. Matthew's* Gospel was first written in *Hebrew*, and *St. Luke's* in *Greek*, this Difference is easily solved; but, however, if you examine your Liturgies, you will find more than a verbal Difference, as I have already instanced in: Prayers for the Dead.

You seem afraid, Page 46, of being charged with begging the Question; a just and rational Consciousness of which I wish you much Joy. I have before proved, that you begged the Question, in taking for granted the *Depositum* mentioned by *St. Paul* was a Liturgy crowded with your Whims; and you come off here no better by saying it must be so, because it must be so.

The Sum of your Argument is this ; St. *Paul* mentions a *Depositum* left in the Hands of *Timothy* ; it was absolutely necessary that St. *Paul* should leave a *Depositum* behind, which contained a Liturgy, with all the Points you want, therefore that *Depositum* must have such a Liturgy.

If the main Question is not here begged, I have done writing till I assume Spectacles. Moreover, here is a manifest Circle again, for to prove the Authority and Evidence of your Liturgies from that Text of Scripture ; and to prove that Text from the Authority and Evidence of your Liturgies, is another Circle for your Reverence to take the Air in.

You fancy a prodigious Point gained by your Performance in your 47th Page : The Apostles say, you did not put in Writing, that the Canon of the new Testament should be of universal Obligation.

If I mistake not, the Canon of the New Testament signifies the Rule of the New Testament, *i. e.* the Rule to know what are the Books of the New Testament ; you might as well have asked, how we prove the Elements of *Euclid* to be of universal Obligation ; for the Canon of the New Testament is not Matter of Observation, but of Science, and the Rule of Practice are the Laws themselves.

I make no other Advantage of this, than to put you in mind of a Mistake ; your following Words declare your Meaning to be, that the New Testament is of universal Obligation.

If you mean by this, that every Part of the New Testament obliges every Person alike, I absolutely deny that ; and no Man of common Sense will, upon a due Consideration, blame me for the same.

If you mean, that every thing in the New Testament expressly mentioned, is of perpetual or universal Obligation, I shall deny that likewise.

For the Compliances with the *Jews* were not of perpetual Obligation ; moreover, the Nature of Laws declare how far they are to oblige, when they are limited for a certain time. 2. When the Cause is taken away for which they were made. 3. When they become, by Accident, of Time, and other Circumstances, impracticable to be performed. 4. When any posteriour Law, in effect, repeals them ; otherwise they must be of perpetual Obligation. *Thou shalt Love the Lord thy God*, surely carries in it self, and in the Manner of promulging the same, a perpetual Obligation. There is no need of Tradition to prove, that Law obliges now ; what is this to your Purpose ? the Evidence for these Things is plain and scriptural.

But when you come to inform us, that we cannot prove what are the Books of the New Testament, except from Tradition, I shall readily grant, internal Evidence alone ; for History can never be sufficient ; but then the internal Evidence, together with the four Marks, are sufficient to confirm any Fact in the World.

What

What can you possibly gain from hence? Not that all Articles necessary to Salvation are not contained in Scripture; even that you shall believe that Canon, as you find it there, is a Scriptural Command, because it is propounded then before you to be believed; for, if every Part commands Credit, the whole must certainly have a Title thereto.

If I should say, how is it possible for me to believe the History of *Henry* the VII. written by my Lord *Bacon*, whereas he has not, in one Place in the whole Book, required me to believe what he says? Surely you would laugh at me for a Fool; and more, if when I have observ'd all the Marks of the Accuracy, Faithfulness and Integrity of an Historian, I would question, whether he had, or not, passed over in Silence the most material Passages of that Reign.

In short, every thing propounded there is to be believed, and, if I take in external Testimony to corroborate, still you are just where you was at the first setting forth on your Journey, You have spurred and whipped upon a Gate, and have made no other Motion than swinging backwards and forwards.

I cannot but observe one Part in your Conduct, shining with inimitable Candour and Integrity; for, though by your vigorous contending for Prayers for the Dead, you seem to be intirely gone over to their Interests; upon other Occasions you use both the Dead and the Living ill a like; nor can the Living Author of *The just Grounds* come off better

than the deceased Dr. *Hammond* and Mr. *Thorndike*.

For in your 48th Page, if we compare it with the Head in the Contents belonging thereto, you use the learned Gentleman not well, nor equal to his Merits.

Your Head is, The Opponent has not proved from the Scripture, that Scripture is the only Rule of Faith.

Whereas the Scope of that Gentleman's Argument was no more than that the Scriptures prescribe us no other Rule of Faith but Scripture; and, that our Lord commended no other Rule to his Disciples. Surely, Sir, there is Difference between a positive and a negative Argument, however you have here put them upon the same Foot; his Argument was no more than negative, and you have made it a positive one in your Contents.

You are justly complained against, for not answering the Testimonies brought from the Fathers; and, more justly complained against for not making a better Excuse for that Omission.

In my Opinion, the Judgment of the Fathers is useful in our Dispute, thus far.

1st. When they mentioned the Scriptures as a compleat Rule of Faith.

2d. When they speak of the Scripture as a Rule of Faith without an oblique View to any other Rule.

3. Their negative Way of treating upon Tradition, not ever mentioning the same as a Rule

Rule of Faith, but as the Hand-maid of the Scriptures, constantly attending to explain or corroborate what was obscurely therein contained.

If you can produce Fathers on your Side, who positively assert, that our blessed Saviour, or his Apostles, delivered down Essentials, in Trust only to the Memory of Posterity; this might give a Colour to your new Schemes, though it would really weaken the Credit of the Fathers, and serve *Whitby* for an Appendix to his *Censura Patrum*; for, considering the Consequence is no less than the eternal Happiness or Misery of Mankind, I can never imagine our blessed Saviour put the Evidence of such momentous things upon a Level with a Fable, or a Family Lie.

But, negatively, the Testimony of the Fathers is useful on our Side, and every Testimony of that Nature cast into the Scale, will weigh down a Thousand of your positive Assertions, without any Foundation at all.

Where are your Testimonies from the Fathers, that our blessed Saviour's Mission was for any other Purpose than what has been delivered in the Scriptures; without this your pretended Essentials can never stand their Ground; for I repeat, that no Point can be an Essential of Christianity, unless it is evidently revealed in the first Place; nor can any thing be an Object of Essentiality in the second, unless it has an immediate Regard to the Christian

istian Religion, as a Society, or to the Mission of our blessed Saviour.

For if we believe him as he is, and obey his Laws, this is the short, but compleat, Creed of Christianity.

For, as in Civil Society the Breach of one or two Laws is not an essential Breach, or what the late Bishop of *Sarum* called an intire Subversion; nevertheless, one subverting Principle is an essential Breach; if we absolutely deny Obedience to the Law of Christ, or own such Principles as destroy that Obedience, we are indeed, essential Hereticks.

But the mistaking a Law, or putting a wrong Interpretation thereon, is not an essential Breach, unless we denied the Power that made those Laws.

I conclude, dear Sir, your Party separated upon the Account of pretended Essentials, before they knew what Essentials were; they proceeded somewhat too fast, and without due Consideration, and yet will not be prevailed with to bethink themselves aright.

In short, the Word Essential is a bold Word; there is a wide Difference between taking down a Picture, a Side, or a Piece of a House, and digging up the Foundations; because, in the first Place, a great deal may be pretended; and, in the second, the whole intirely comes to nought.

If, therefore, your Party had modestly dropt the Word Essential, they might have made a better

better Retreat; but now it is a Burthen they must carry with them where-ever they go; and, if it is their Fate, to be put to swim, or not to tread on firm Ground, the Weight will sink them for ever.

But, to make Essentials by guesses, and to damn People positively for not guessing like your selves, is only making Salvation a Game of Cross-Purposes. There seems, in all this, so much of the old Fanatick Spirit, that, pardon me, dear Sir, if I say, *Cartwright* or *Tramm* were not more dogmatical, more positive than you are; and whose is the most unaccountable Schism, is pretty difficult to be known.

I pray, Sir, with all your Positiveness, is not *St. Jerom* plainly against you? For, if he says that we are to stick to the things that are written, this is opposed to our forming Essentials from our own Brains; if every thing is to be despised that has not the Authority of Scripture, then surely nothing must be taken up as an Article of Faith, which has no Foundation or Authority of Scripture to support it. I say, these ought to have been directly answered, for, they seem to me, utterly to overthrow your Schemes; but alas! to this you only make a slight Return: Oh! say you, did *St. Jerom* mean, that Tradition should be despised? Yes, he did mean, that such Tradition as yours was to be despised, because it has not the Authority of Scripture; and yet, Impostor-like, pretends to vye with the same. However, Tradition, retained in moderate Bounds, is not despised by such
Treat-

Treatment: I am far from despising *Horace* or *Virgil*; as I honour the one for his Majesty, and the other for his Wit; but I shall never, according to the vulgar Errour, believe them Prophets, nor put their Writings upon a Foot with Canonical Scripture.

Suppose St. *Jerom* does argue against *Jovinian* and *Vigilantius*, in behalf of Tradition, does he there, or in any other Places, assert, that it has handed down Articles of Faith, independant of the sacred Writ? This would be contradictory to himself, and fordidly impertinent.

It's strange these Passages should not appear to you more formidable, whereas they strike at the very Root of your Hypothesis, as I have shewn. You demand a Scrutiny, which I shall readily grant. What Prophecies, say you, do we pretend to receive, that agree not with the Scriptures? Yes, you prophesy concerning a future State; like *Montanus*, you pretend to know, not only in what State the Dead are, but also what State they will be in after they have had a few of your unnecessary Prayers: You know all the Ranks and Preferments amongst your selves, fine imaginary Ideas like the Presbyterian Predestination, or, like a Reverend Doctor of a certain University, who took infinite Care to barricade his College against the wild *Irish*, and, finally, shut himself out. I wish this may not be your Fate; that it may not, shall alive be my Prayer, and when you are dead, shift for your selves.

What

What Revelations have ye set up? Yes the Turning Water into an essential Ingredient, is a new Revelation, not supported either by one single Instance in the Scripture, or by one single Passage in the Fathers.

In short, Sir, you may flourish as long as you please, but St. *Ferom* is against you; the Course of his Argument, and the whole Scope of his Discourse tends to prove, that we are to believe nothing *without* the Authority of the Scripture.

After all this, comes on such a furious Attack as must necessarily cost some one or other a great Loss of their Sense and Understanding.

St. *Ferom* against *Helvidius* is set in so clear a Light by your learned Adversary, that I admire your Courage and Boldness, Dexterity and Cunning, in turning the Attack upon him.

The Case is thus stated. *Helvidius* denied the perpetual Virginity of the Blessed Virgin. To maintain his Opinion, he shelter'd himself under several Texts of Scripture. St. *Ferom*, in order to confute him, first examines them, and finally draws this Conclusion, *ut quæ scripta sunt non negamus, ita quæ non scripta sunt re-nuimus. i. e.* As we do not deny what we find written, so we reject what we find not written. *i. e.* in other Words: If we could have found any Text of Scripture agreeable to your Sentiments, we would have come into the same, so as we do not find your Notions therein, we reject them.

There cannot be a more plain and absolute Proof on our Side of the Question than this

seems to be. However, *Doctior Brett*, has turn'd this Passage of *St. Jerom* against us Point blank.

Surely, dear Sir, your Service must be of the greatest Consequence to your Party, if, upon your Appearance in the Field, all our Forces desert us, and declare on your Side.

St. Jerom opposed a Notion of *Helvidius*, because it was not found in Scripture, and concludes from thence, that it must be absolutely false. This, you have the Pleasure of saying is on your Side in Behalf of Tradition. What Appearance it has, let any who have common Sense be Judges; and by what Magick you have turn'd the Tables upon us, I shall next examine.

In the first Place, you raise a Cloud, in order, as one would imagine, to make a Retreat; but the real Design is taken from the King of *Sweden* at the Battel of *Narva*, you blind our Eyes, in order to obtain a more easy and sure Victory.

For, dear Sir, was *St. Jerom's* Dispute concerning the Consistency or Inconsistency of Tradition with Scripture? Is there one Word of that in the whole Dispute? That Father's Words have only Relation to what is contain'd in Scripture; and he concludes that *Helvidius* must be in the wrong, because he insisted upon a Notion which had not the least Foundation in Scripture at all.

With what Surprise then do I hear, you say, that *St. Jerom* argues in Behalf of Tradition, because the Scripture has not taught the perpetual Virginity of the Virgin *Mary*? For you
may

may as well say, that I argue in Behalf of Tradition, because I say your essential Points are not found in Scripture: Yet with what an Air of florid Positiveness you run on, with Impetuosity that wants more a Bit than a Spur; for tho' we suppose St. *Jerom* does not make a Distinction expressly in determinate Words, between Things necessary, and not necessary; however, a little Logick will make a positive Implication: For if the perpetual Virginity of the Virgin was a necessary Article of Faith, St. *Jerom* is your declared Enemy; and if it was not, surely we may conclude, that if even unnecessary or circumstantial Disputes, which are at the same time the Objects of Religion, are not to be credited unless they are found in Scripture, much less must we take up with Essentials not found therein.

Where then does St. *Jerom* make it an Error in *Helvidius*, to oppose Tradition? You have not, dear Sir, rightly turn'd your Argument upon us. For, say you, *p. 55. Scripture is a Rule prescrib'd by our Lord to his Disciples to walk by, we believe, because it is written. That Tradition is excluded by our Lord from being a Rule to walk by, we do not believe, because it is not written, because we read no Exclusion in the Scripture.* This you put upon a Level with St. *Jerom's* Way of arguing, whereas it is most opposite thereto. For, according to him, Tradition cannot be a Rule, because it is not said to be in the Scripture; not that it is a Rule, because it is not said to be a Rule. An Heretick

might argue in this Manner, but an orthodox Father never could. You may indeed after this Manner proceed very roundly with Mixing Water with Wine; Scripture no where says you shall not mix Water with Wine, therefore you ought so to do. Whereas St. *Jerom*, if he was alive, would tell you, that Water is not an Essential Ingredient in the Eucharist; for if the Scripture said that it was, there would be no Dispute concerning the same: But we are obliged to reject what the Scripture does not mention.

You see plainly, Sir, by this time, you have chang'd the State of the Question, and made St. *Jerom* speak as inconsistently as your selves; and the Whole of all the Argument in your Book turns thus, It is so, because it is so, and It is so, because it is not so.

But where, in God's Name, is St. *Jerom* so plainly on your Side? Does he say, that Tradition is to be adher'd to, when the Scripture does not assert the contrary? Can all this be extracted from this plain, simple, and unaffected Expression, *We must reject what is not written*? This Chymistry in Polemicks will reduce Christianity to a *Caput mortuum*: Pardon me, dear Sir, if Passion breaks forth into a little Resentment. If this Way of Writing or of Arguing is allow'd of, we may shake the Alphabet, and draw Lots for Religion, for Sense, or for Learning. Then indeed your Whimfies may rise up beautiful Essentials: Pride, Obstinacy, and Prejudice may turn Christian Meek-

Meekness, Condescension and Candor, out of Doors.

Pardon me, if for the Reader's Information, I lay down St. Jerom's own Words, and place yours overagainst them.

St. JEROM.

Doctor BRETT.

As we do not deny the Things that are written, so we reject the Things that are not written. We believe God to have been born of a Virgin, because we read it: We do not believe Mary to have married after her Delivery, because we do not read it.

That Scripture is a Rule prescrib'd by our Lord to his Disciples to walk by, we believe, because it is written: That Tradition is excluded by our Lord from being a Rule for his Disciples to walk by, we do not believe, because we read no such Exclusion in Scripture.

I beg the judicious Reader to find the Agreement betwixt St. Jerom and Dr. Brett.

That Scripture is a Rule prescrib'd by our Lord to walk by, because it is written; I suppose you mean, that it is said so to be in the Scriptures. This, dear Sir, is another Circle; for, to prove that the Scripture is a Rule to walk by, because the Rule is prescrib'd by Scripture, is as plain a Circle as any of the former. So that indeed you are catch'd by your own Magick.

Now to draw the Parallel. Does St. Jerom say, that he believes the Scripture because it is written?

written? No; he believes the Things that are written, not, I suppose, because they are written, but because they are the Word of God.

To return to you, Sir. *That Tradition is excluded, &c. we do not believe, because we read of no such Exclusion in the Scripture.* The Result of which is, that we are obliged to believe every thing we do not find in Scripture. By this time we are to come to this Argument, That Scripture is a Rule prescrib'd by our Lord to his Disciples, we believe, because it is written; that the *Alchoran* is excluded from being a Rule, we do not believe, because we have no such Exclusion in the Scripture.

Does St. *Jeron* argue in this Manner? Far from it. He believes God to have been born of a Virgin, because it is expressly so delivered in the inspired Writings. He will not believe that *Mary* married, because he does not find that the Scripture does any where expressly say that she was married.

Do not we say, in the same Manner, we believe our blessed Saviour gave Bread and Wine to his Disciples, because it is expressly so said? But we do not believe he gave Water mix'd with the Wine, because it is not so said.

I know you would turn the Tables upon us, and make the Argument run thus. We must believe Water to be mix'd with Wine, because we do not read of any such Exclusion in the Scripture.

The Reader will find the Magick vanish, if he but considers, that the Old Father and the
New

New differ in their Premisses; for, St. *Jerom* insists upon a positive Affirmation in the Scripture, and the Doctor upon a Negation, which produce vastly different Conclusions; for, according to the Doctor's Argument I can prove, that the *Dromedaries*, mentioned *Esth.* viii. 10. were no *Dromedaries*; for, that they were not Males, I prove thus; that the Scripture is a Rule prescribed, &c. we believe, because it is written; that these *Dromedaries* were Males, I do not believe, because I do not find it written in Scripture, that they were not Females. *Vice versa*, I can prove, after the same Manner, they were not said to be Males.

If ever the Times called for a Restraint upon the Press, it is certainly when so little Regard is had to Decency, or Coherence in Writing; I am very sorry it falls to my Share, to expose an old Friend in these Colours: But, as you have entred upon Hostilities, by the Laws of Writing, I must be your Adversary: A publick Quarrel and Duty over-rule all private Considerations.

Having thus discussed St. *Jerom*, you proceed to *Irenæus*, you say he does not distinguish Tradition from the Word of God.

As I have observed before, if the Fathers mention the Scriptures as the only Rule of Faith, if they speak of them in such a Manner as seems exclusive of any other Conveyance; this is against you, and so far are all the Fathers.

For, let them appeal to Tradition for a Succession of Bishops, these are only Circumstances

stances subsequent to the Penning of the Sacred Writ. Let even *Tertullian* cry up Tradition as the Conservation of Faith, he said this in Opposition to those Hereticks who pretended to false Scriptures; he appeals to Tradition, as more properly the Conservation of the written Rule, than being a Rule it self. There is a wide Difference between the Stream of a River, and the Vessel that it carries upon it: And if the Father says, that our Faith must be Apostolick, because it is derived from Apostolick Men; it does not follow, but that it may be derived from the sacred Writ, which Writ was Handed down by Apostolick Men, and a legal Succession of Bishops.

Your Business is therefore never done, till you prove that Essentials either, as to Worship or to Faith, were delivered by oral Tradition to future Ages unrecorded in Scripture; for this you have not one single Testimony.

When *Irenæus* or any of the Fathers appeal to Tradition, they do not appeal to it in your Sense, nor did ever any one Father say, that all things necessary to Salvation were not contained in Scripture; and even *Irenæus* before us, arguing against the Hereticks of his Age, calls the Scripture the Foundation and Pillar of our Faith, which it could not be if it had not all the Essentials of our Religion: Therefore let your Tradition have its Office of explaining, but you beg the Question, if you make it speak of Essentials where the Scriptures are silent.

That

That the Word of God may be delivered by Tradition, I have no where denied; but another Question arises, how faithfully Tradition will preserve the Word of God? And, how well it has been preserved by both the Eastern and Western Churches, is known to any one, meanly conversant in Ecclesiastical History.

When you come to your Instances, they are no more than a pitiful begging the Question; *Timothy's Depositum* was the *Clementine Liturgy*, or something very like it. This, you say, you have proved; I have before observed in what Manner, by saying it is so, because it must be so.

If for the sake of disputing farther, I should grant, that *St. Paul* taught *Timothy* a Liturgy; to say by Heart, you are still in the Dark, as to the essential Parts of that Liturgy; for here Tradition shakes Hands, and leaves you to shift for your selves. I hope you will not insist that the whole was Essential, for then, I am sure, you can have no true Worship in your own dear Church; and, in spite of all you have said, Water may be no Essential, though we grant it was put into Wine, in Countries where it was a Scandal to drink it in another Manner: Nay, even though *St. Cyprian's* warm Fancy might allegorize thereon, as was a Method peculiar to almost all the Fathers.

St. Basil, you acknowledge, clearly asserts, that it is a manifest falling from the Faith, and a great Instance of Pride, either to set aside

any thing of those that are written, or to introduce any of the things that are not written.

Thus far he is on our Side, but then you produce him on your own, particularly speaking of things which have the same Obligation in Regard to Godliness.

Your Way of reconciling these seeming Contradictions, next comes under my Examination: You distinguish Articles of Faith from Matters of Worship; but, however, if you can find Essentials of Worship, independant of any Article of Faith, I will give up the Cause.

What is Worship but the Adoration of the supream Being? The Manner of this Worship are, the various Methods prescribed by which that Worship shall be performed; nothing therefore can be an Essential of Worship, unless it has such a close Connection with the Adoration of God, that without it God is not worshipped at all.

It is essential to the Worship of God that it be done with all the Circumstances of Obedience to his Commands.

Concerning these Methods of Worship, St. Basil speaks, which he calls unwritten, or ecclesiastical Customs.

But, as I have before observed, the Commands of God must be, in this Case, clearly and infallibly conveyed to make them, in so strict a Manner, obligatory to us; and this we must lay down as a Foundation, that God never designed those Laws to oblige,
which

which are precariously delivered to us. Does a Master of a Family deliver a Jewel to his Posterity to preserve, carelessly cast about every Corner of his House? So cannot God consistently with his Attributes, transmit eternal Laws to the precarious Custody of a treacherous Memory.

Let, therefore, these Customs be never so piously observed, when they are known, they are now wash'd away by Time; from whence we may conclude, that they are arbitrary Customs, and not the eternal Pleasure of God.

It is essential therefore to the Worship of God, to adore him as he is, and, as he has commanded us to do; and when his Commands do not appear fully and clearly, he does not require them to be eternally obligatory to us.

Neither does it appear that every Practice or Method recurred to, either by the Apostles or by the primitive Christians, was immutable in its own Nature; for, we have no human Proof that it is so, either from Matters of Fact, or from rational Inferences; for, if it were so, some more steady and authentic Testimony might, and would have been preserved (tho' in the Bowels of the Earth) than the Memory.

Moreover, all the Liturgies through the World would have been uniform, whereas the Variations are evident. I beg to know by what Light we shall come at the Knowledge of Essentials?

You say, Water must be a constituent Part of the Cup; but why? neither St. *Cyprian* could find it out in his Time, nor you since. You say our Saviour practised it, which you gather from uncertain Guesses and Conjectures of your own: He might, and he might not still, or at least, for ought you have proved to the contrary, he never designed to make it Essential. Here your Proofs fail, and you fly off to your antient Method of asserting without Proof. If the Vulgar are dazzled with this Assurance, I pity their unhappy Measures, to pin the Salvation of their immortal Souls upon your Sleeves; and to be carried a way by the ostentatious Pretence to Learning, without the Foundation of true Sense and Reason.

You can never charge us with a Nullity in our Worship, unless you fix upon us, that it tends to destroy the Adoration due to the supream Being; or, that it is immoral, or otherwise contradictory to the Divine Commands.

A Church without an Eucharist, where it can be had, labours under an essential Defect, because God has commanded us to celebrate the same; we have an express written Law for Bread and Wine, but, as to Water, it cannot be essential, because it has not that Sanction; and thus far we are safe.

The Nature of the thing will discover an essential Defect. Immorality in our Prayers cannot consist with the Adoration of God, because it mocks his Attributes: Prayers to the Virgin are immoral, because God alone is the
Object

Object of our Prayers, and Christ alone our Intercessor.

To disobey the Commands of God, where they appear to be of perpetual Obligation, is so far from Adoration, that it is subtracting from our Obedience to God, as it is an Act of Contumacy to refuse Obedience to the Commands of an earthly Prince.

St. *Basil*, dear Sir, has nothing to do with Essentials, nor had he one Word thereof; he speaks of Ecclesiastical Customs which we ought, in Prudence, to obey, unless we would do an Injury to the Gospel it self; for, if we grant, that he meant more, he proves too much; for, as I have observed, if all indiscriminately demanded an indispensable Obedience, because they were Apostolical Practices, the first Stone of your Church is not yet laid; your Liturgy labours under Defects; for it will be hard to prove it is the Apostolick one: And in the second Place, it wants some common Sense, and consequently it is essentially defective in two Respects.

Thus you must unchurch you selves, or stoop down a little lower; you must have some other *Criterion* for your Essentials, or you are gone for ever. Your Distinction to reconcile St. *Basil* is lost, and he still remains asserting, that to advance any thing not written, is Pride, and falling from the Faith.

With what Freedom you charge the learned Author with giving up the Canon of the Scripture, in order to maintain his Argument, is Matter of severe Reflection, because you have
not

not informed us where, and in what Manner, he has so done; nor indeed, can I find where he was so hard pressed, I am sure, not by your Arguments, if I may have Liberty to Speak my Mind.

You have brought Mr. *Thorndike* upon the Stage once more, I suppose, lest your Play should not take, unless you sometimes produce a Ghost; for he might as well have walked cross the Stage, and not have spoke one Word, as utter Part of an Epilogue written in his Lifetime, nothing to your Purpose.

I do not deny, that a Liturgy might possibly be delivered by the Apostles to their Successors by Heart; but still, Mr. *Thorndike* has not touched upon the Essentials of this Liturgy; and, if he had insisted, that we were indispensibly obliged to use theirs, and no other, in Honour he was obliged let us know where it was to be found; for let the Memories of the primitive Christians be never so good, we have no Liturgies at present, which have not been dragged through Popery; and, if we go to them to learn Essentials, we very well know what a Lesson they will teach us.

I will not contend against Tradition's explaining the Scripture, even in some Essential Points, but then it must have the four Marks, as particularly Episcopacy, concerning which I shall spend a few Words.

That the Apostles devolved Church Powers to those who were to succeed them, is plain from Scripture it self, by the Instructions given to *Timothy* and *Titus*: The next Question arises

ses, Whether Bishops as now constituted in the Church, have an Apostolick Right to those Powers devolved by the Apostles? This will necessarily be determin'd, if we can prove, that they are lawful Successors to those to whom those Church Powers were devolved. We must in this Case consider them, either as to their intrinsick Powers, or to the Jurisdiction they now exercise. As to the first, they have as certain a Conveyance of intrinsick Powers, as any pretended Presbyter can be presum'd to have; for none can pretend Presbyters to be of a superior Order to Bishops, with whatever Earnestness they may assume to themselves an Equality.

As to Jurisdiction, when we have gain'd that Point, the whole Controversy concerning Episcopacy is finished.

That they exercise the same Jurisdiction as the Successors of the Apostles did, may in this Manner be prov'd.

That Mens Eyes and Ears could be Judges whether one particular Person call'd himself by the particular Name of Bishop, and the rest of the Clergy had Denominations different from his, according to the Inferiority of their Orders. And that he exercis'd Jurisdiction over a whole District of these Clergy, cannot be denied by any ingenuous Man. For surely our Ears and Eyes are Judges, that the King of *England* presides over his Parliament; for Acts of publick Authority are the Objects of our Ears and of our Eyes.

The

The ordaining of this Person a Bishop by the Imposition of Hands of Bishops, exclusive of Presbyters, and all the other publick Characteristicks of Bishops, are at the same time the Object of our Senses; and outward Signs commencing immediately from the first Institution, the sacred Dypticks were Monuments preserved of the Fact; or at least, if they have not been able to stand the Teeth of Time, the Succession of Bishops to this Day is a lasting Monument, and will continue to be so to the End of the World.

Now, that the outward Signs commenc'd immediately from the Apostles Times, will appear, if we consider, that there was such a mutual Connection between the outward Signs and the Institution, that one could not exist without the other. For, as we have Ecclesiastical Records which testify, that *St. Peter* was Bishop of *Rome*, *St. Mark* of *Alexandria*, &c. at least when those Ecclesiastical Histories first stood the Test of the publick Light, there were not above two or three who had pretended to be direct Successors to any Apostolick Bishop of any See mention'd: I say, in so short a time, those Signs could not be impos'd upon the World. For if Mens Eyes and Ears were Witnesses that Presbyters constituted over every Congregation, had the Power of ordaining; their Eyes and Ears must also be Witnesses when that Power was taken away. Their Eyes must also be Witnesses when they saw one particular Person ordain exclusively of the rest. They could
no

not, for Instance, he asleep at *Rome*, when they saw *Clemens*, a Bishop invested with Power over Presbyters, and shining Signs of that Power in every Exercise of Authority, and in the publick Style and Characters given. In short, I cannot see why there is not equal Proof for this, as for the Abolition of the *Jewish Sabbath*, and the Institution of the Lord's Day.

In short, such a monstrous Usurpation of Power can never take place at one Blow ; Ages may, in time, produce such things, when the first Advances are so slow, that the Eyes and Ears are not struck with the Change, like the Motion of the Hand of a Clock : We cannot see the first Vibrations of Motion, though the Alteration visibly appears in time.

Upon the Whole, dear Sir, this Instance of Episcopacy will do you no Service, because it has a more noble and strong Dependence than your precarious Tradition ; nay, I flatter myself, that I have fully proved it can stand its Ground even upon Scripture alone, in my Answer to the *Scotch Presbyterian of Dumbarton*.

If indeed you would have Scripture prove what was done after the sacred Writ was published, I must tell you, this is an extravagant Demand, where Prophecy is not concerned : If *St. Paul* had given a Catalogue of Bishops of *Rome* up as far as *St. Irenaeus's* Days, I should have equally distrusted his Epistles as I do the Apostolick Constitutions.

After what has been said, another Question arises, what the Unlearned are to do in this Dis-

pute? you have, indeed, very modestly determined, Page 99. that none but your selves are, at present, qualified to resolve what the unlearned are to do, because ye have studied the Controversy seven Years, and you think it very hard that ye cannot in that time be Masters of Antiquity, Universality, and Consent, as well as a Tailor be able to learn his Trade in a seven Years Servitude.

I take for granted before you made your Separation, you studied, at least, seven Years, and that you had these Essentials in your Eye when you was a formal Jurant, and held a Living in Romney-marsh; that you did not care to suspend your self till your Scruples grew almost to Age; and, that you had these things under the Agitation even when you invited me over (I cannot say disputed me) into the Nonjurant Church, where your Learnedship assured me only Salvation was to be had. In my Opinion, you ought to have suspended your Censure, till you had finished your seven Years Study.

I desire to know how pretty a Scene it would have been to an impartial Stander-by, if, at a certain time, near the Water-Side, an unlearned Person had come to you, for your Opinion, concerning your present Essentials, (I am very confident neither the Matter of Fact, nor the Scene is falsely laid) and you had told him, very gravely, that such Points were not Grounds of Separation; that God forbid you should have any Thoughts of leaving the Commu-
 14
 nion

nion of the Church of England; and that within four Minutes after you should return with a positive Determination, that all were damned in that Church; what Comfort would the Unlearned find in consulting your Reverence? I suppose you wanted four Minutes of finishing your seven Years Study.

In short, if any of your Party have served out their Time in this Controversy, they are fit only to serve it again before they pretend to set up for themselves, or resolve Questions before they are half instructed in their Trade. I know one who had a Language to learn after he had even resolved to answer a Book, which had an immediate Dependence upon the same.

As, dear Sir, your first Essential depends so much upon Rabbinical Learning, how shall an unlearned Person know to whom to apply on your Side of the Question? If he comes to one, he has had the Cares of the World too much upon him; another has not gone through his Grammar, &c.

I stop here only to forbear Reflections, and will return to some more serious Expostulations.

God never designed the Vulgar to be absolute Judges of Scripture, but to judge no farther than concerned themselves. No Man is accountable for a greater Share of Knowledge than God has given him; and, if the Vulgar keep themselves within the Sphere of common Sense and common Reason, their Guides are answerable for the rest; but what Relation has this to

you who have no spiritual Jurisdiction over them, who first renounced them, as not being your Flock, and then call them after you: They can have no Deference for your Sollicitations, to whom the Cure of their Souls does in no wise belong.

The Unlearned therefore, in all Probability, will rather chuse to repair to those for whom they have retained some Esteem (for it is to be supposed they are no competent Judges of Learning and Merit) than to you, from whom they are to expect blind Dictates, and Demands of Absolute Submission.

It's certain you have given them no encouraging Marks to repair to you; for they must first be convinced, that you are in the Right, before they can look upon you to be their Guides and Instructors; for Schism is wrote in Capitals upon your Foreheads, unless you make out your Essentials to be well grounded. And, when they are first satisfied that you are in the right, they are in a fit Condition to ask Questions, and to seek the Law from your Mouths.

But, dear Sir, though the Scriptures were wrote first in one Language, and therefore could not be in that Language a Rule of Faith to all the World; nevertheless, Christianity is not made up of Riddles: The Translations unless, they are purposely perverted, are a sufficient Key to the Unlearned, to shew them their Duty: If a Man designs a Voyage to the *West-Indies* in a Vessel of his own, if he understands
nothing

nothing of Navigation, he trusts intirely to somebody else, with whom he has made his Agreement, and who has the Reputation of understanding the Matter. If he knows a little of the Art, he will venture, with his Advice, no farther than he knows; and, if he is perfect Master of the Art, he may venture upon his own Strength to guide the Ship to the desired Port: But, if he is mistaken in his Opinion of himself, and proves neither so wise nor so skilful as he fancies, he is accountable for the Folly and Imprudence, and all the ill Consequences of his rash Undertaking; or, if he is such a Fool as to take up with pretended Guides, and has only their Assurance to rely upon, he is likewise answerable for their ill Conduct.

The Unlearned therefore must try their Strength, and consider that they tread upon treacherous Ground; and if they leap from it into your Ecclesiastical Territories, they are upon a worse Bog than before.

But, surely, it is a Trap both for the Learned and for the Unlearned, if Essentials depend upon Testimony, and this Testimony is doubtful. Does God, think you, put the Issue of Man's eternal Happiness upon Topicks which may or may not be so? And has he no other Church but yours in the World? And has it no other Foundation than that Dr. Brett, and one or two more, conceive they have found out new Essentials from this Notion so injurious to the Justice and Goodness of God? For if you should happen to have wrong Conceptions, (as
you

you will not be alone) what is become of your Church, and of your Souls? Your calling out for *Bangorian* Sincerity can never be a saving Plea at that Day, when the Secrets of all Hearts will be disclosed.

It is very pleasant to be directed in Cases of this Nature by the Dead, who cannot be called upon to explain their own Meaning, and of whom Advantage is taken from several scattered Passages in their Writings. Surely the Living are more proper to be asked Questions of this Nature than the Dead; especially when you own, Page 84, that its very probable Dr. *Hammond* had not even these Points in his own Eye; you could not, indeed, fix upon a more proper Person to require Judgment from in this Case; but suppose the unlearned Person never so much as stumbled upon this Passage of Dr. *Hammond's*, nor should ever happen to see your Direction, what shall he then do?

Why, then, it is an even Wager, that Dr. *Hickes* will fall in his Way; and he tells you of the Consent of Ancient Liturgies, of the 12. 13. 14. Chapters of the Apostolick Constitutions.

Peace to the Memory of that Great Man; he never wrote or talk'd inconsistently, but when he fell upon your Essentials. I could almost blush for Indignation, to see a Man of his Learning harp upon a few ridiculous Liturgies, and call them the universal Practice of the primitive Church; and to hear him so solemnly and gravely quote the Apostolick Con-
stitutions

stitutions, the spurious Offspring of a weak, hot-headed Impostor.

But I pray, Sir, why may not the Unlearned follow as well the Practice as the Opinion of this Great Man, especially when I take it for granted you will not dispute his Integrity and his Piety. But lo! here you drop him, because he does not please you. He died in the Church of *England*, and lov'd it living with Fervour, and that, I am afraid, is not like to be your Case.

I am very much surprized to find you so artfully and industriously do the Work of the Papists, who themselves endeavour to weaken the Authority of the Scriptures, and run them down. But why Dr. Brett should lend an helping Hand, is pretty unaccountable, especially since his Vindication. The Scriptures, you say, are not to be understood without Traditions and the *Jewish Talmud*.

To send us to the *Jewish Talmud*, to explain the New Testament, is pretty odd, as odd as your sending to a *Jew* to know what were the Essentials of Christianity. If the ancientest Part of the *Talmud* had no Being before 150 Years after Christ, *i. e.* in *Justin Martyr's* Time, the Christian Religion, and our whole Rule of Faith, I hope, were intelligible before that Time: And if so, to what Purpose does the *Talmud* serve? I suppose a Darkness overtook the Scripture, which the *Talmud* expell'd.

Surely

Surely I need not ask, whether it is probable that God should make a Christian Law, and Damnation its Penalty; and at the same time render it necessary to be explain'd by the execrable *Rabbins*, of whom I can say nothing too bad? I must agree even with an *Adversary in one Point, that their Credit, even as to the *Jewish* Affairs, is of no Value, if we consider their notorious Art of Lying, their Impudence and Ignorance at the same time; and more particularly, that those profess'd Enemies to Christianity, heap'd all the Blasphemies upon our blessed Saviour, that Malice could invent, or a virulent Tongue utter. These are very hopeful Commentators upon Christianity, and Explainers upon our Essentials.

Nay, to send us to the Devil to explain the Scriptures, is a very forward Advance. The *Talmud* expressly says, That none is received into the *Sanhedrim*, unless he is a Conjuror. From whence I take for granted, the Persons who composed the *Talmud* were no better. A very formidable Alliance you have made, Doctor, of which I wish you much Joy, with the Devils, and the *Jews*, in order to sustain your Infant Title to the only Catholick Church upon Earth.

Your Distinction between no Regard and the lowest Regard, is pretty finely drawn; tho' for my Part I cannot see the Difference; for the lowest Degree of Regard in our *English* Language

* Mr. Gale's Answer to Mr. Wall.

is equivalent to no Degree at all; for it is suppos'd to be reduc'd so low, as to be of no Consideration. We very well know, *flacci facere* is to pay no Regard to a Man; yet *flaccus* is a Fleece of Wooll, and you may as well conclude that *flacci facere* is to have some Regard, because a Fleece of Wooll comes under the Class of something. Moreover, if a Man (perhaps my self) should say, that he values not your Way of arguing more than a Louse, you would think it no Compliment paid to your Writings. Our learned Author is most certainly wrong'd, if you say he did not Bishop *Walton* Justice. For this we may appeal to any Persons indu'd with common Sense; for the lowest Regard we pay to Writings, is to contemn 'em. And if this is any additional Authority to your *Rabbins*, according to my ancient Custom, I wish you much Joy. If the lowest Degree of Regard is sufficient for your Purpose, that lowest Degree of Regard must certainly be of the lowest Consequence to your Cause. And thus much for your low Arguments, which are but one Hair's Breadth from no Argument at all.

You are pleas'd, after this, to quarrel with the learned Author, for confounding the *Jerusalem* and the *Babylonian Talmud* together, as if he had very much injur'd the one, by coupling it with the other. The *Jerusalem Talmud*, I find, is your Favourite, yet was this compil'd 230 Years after Christ. I have not at present *Lightfoot* by me; however, I shall

N

candid-

candidly transcribe a Passage observ'd by another * Author, and which I have Reason to vouch as true.

Says Lightfoot, Vol. 2. p. 73. There are some who believe the Holy Bible was pointed by the wise Men of Tiberias. I do not wonder at the Impudence of the Jews, who invented the Story; but I wonder at the Credulity of the Jews who applauded it. Recollect, I beseech you, the Names of the Rabbins of Tiberias, from the first Situation of the University there, to the Time that it expir'd, and what at length do you find, but a kind of Men mad with Pharisaism, bewitching with Traditions, and bewitched, blind, guileful, doting? They must pardon me, if I say, magical and monstrous: Men, how unfit, how unable, how foolish for the Undertaking! So, Divine, read over the Jerusalem Talmud, and see there how R. Judah, R. Channah, &c. and the rest of the grand Doctors among the Rabbins at Tiberias, behave themselves; how earnestly they do nothing, how childishly they handle serious Matters; how much of Sophistry, Froth, Poison, Smoke, nothing at all, there is in their Disputes; and if you can believe the Bible was pointed in such a School, believe also all that the Talmudists wrote.

By this time they are very capacitated Expositors of Essentials in the Scriptures. Pray consult the aforesaid Author, and hear

* Answer to Mr. Wall's Hist. of Infant Baptism.

Justin Martyr's Opinion of the Rabbins, That all those Places of Scripture manifestly contrary to their senseless Councils, they would evade, by denying they are so written. And again. As for your Rabbins, I have no Credit for 'em, who have the Confidence to reject the Translation made by the 76 Elders under Ptolomy Philadelphus King of Ægypt, and set themselves up for Interpreters. And I would have you understand, that they have wholly taken out, and disown many Passages of Scripture which are in this Translation; from whence it is plainly prov'd to have been foretold, that this crucified Person was both God and Man, and that he should be crucified and put to Death.

By this time your beloved *Justin Martyr* has given your infallible Interpreters of Scripture a clean Wipe. Can such bitter Fountains as these send forth the eternal Waters of Life? Can Blasphemers, Conjurers, Ideots, Knaves, and Liars, open the Treasures of that Knowledge which alone makes us happy.

I desire to know why the *Rabbins* who liv'd 180, or 230, or 500 Years, after our Saviour, and of whose Integrity we have produc'd such rare Instances, should be better Explainers of the Scriptures, than their Neighbours and Contemporaries, of a more honest Profession and better Characters? Moreover, I would know, whether the *Rabbins* are the most competent Judges of the Antiquity of their own Nation? Or whether our Moderns are more, or as competent Judges of *Chaucer*, as himself and his

Contemporaries were. Two Hundred and thirty Years creates a vast Difference in Languages and Customs; so that, at the best, supposing these Men to be indu'd with Integrity and Learning, they were still far from Infallibility in their Writings. But to assert them absolutely necessary to interpret Scripture, would make a Freethinker, a Deist, or an Atheist laugh. Have we no Weapons except what the Devil lends us, to defend our Religion? I pray take which you please, only let the Scripture be ours.

Of what Use will these *Rabbins* prove to your Scheme? Why, it is no more than that the Paschal Cup was mix'd. This is the only Step; but you have a great many more, before you can arrive at your View; for after that, you must prove, that our blessed Saviour so exactly imitated that Paschal Cup at his Supper, this is the second Step. Thirdly, That he made that Imitation absolutely necessary at all Times. Fourthly, That the Mixture was ever look'd upon as a sacred Action by the *Jews*. Fifthly, That it was design'd as such by our Saviour.

As to the First, I do not wonder, in a Country where it was scandalous to drink Wine unmix'd, as it would be here to drink Brandy at our Sacrament, that the Paschal was mix'd Wine. Suppose I do grant this for once, to put you in a good Humour; what Benefit will you reap from hence?

As to the Second, That our blessed Saviour so exactly imitated that Custom, this is a mere
Guess

Guess supported by Strength of Imagination, and therefore can be no Foundation of a Divine Law : It has not the Testimony of one Father, nor of one Text of Scripture ; and though this Probability may smoothe your Fancy, God has not put the Salvation of our Souls upon such precarious Terms.

3dly. That he made that Imitation necessary at all times, when the *Jewish* Passover was to be no more, is highly improbable ; for, by the same Reason, he would have instituted bitter Herbs to be eaten at the Sacrament ; and, if one was a Type of the other, it does not follow that there should be an Exactitude in every Particular absolutely required. As that there was not, is plainly evident.

But I pray, why was there more Stress laid upon the Paschal Cup than the Paschal Lamb ? Why was Bread instituted instead of one, and Water made so essentially necessary to be retained in the other ? Can you, dear Sir, assign one Reason for this ? Have you one Testimony from the Fathers, or one Lift from Tradition, to help you out of this Mire ?

4thly. That the Mixture was ever looked upon as a sacred Act by the *Jews*, is contradicted, if we consider your own Citations, Page 92. *Men do not bless the Wine till Water is poured into it, says R. Eliezer, but the Wise-Men say, they do bless the Wine before it is mixed.* Here is a wide Difference with them, concerning a most material Circumstance, *viz.* whether the Water was blessed, or not ; for if
it

it was not blessed, it could be no essential Ingredient of the Paschal Cup. Moreover, the Reason assigned by *Eliezer* why it should not be blessed before it was mixed, was, because it was not fit to be drank. This was no more than a prudential Reason, and when Circumstances alter that prudential Reason, the Obligation ceases; for Example, however strong the Wines may be in the East, the Country Wines in *France*, and several other Places, are more fit to be drank without Water than with it.

However, you are pleased to say, that if it was mixed before it was drank, it matters not whether it was upon a prudential or a religious Account, or not; wherereas I thought the whole Controversy depended upon this Question; for, how can a secular Action be an Essential of religious Worship, when it has no Dependence upon the same? Prudential Actions are no Laws, but the Effects of Freedom and of Reason; and what is prudential at one time, may not be so at another, the Obligation therefore cannot be eternal.

I must really own, dear Sir, you have struck me with Astonishment once more, to find such an unhappy Slip from a judicious Pen, like yours; if it was mixed then, it must be mixed now, *i. e.* If there had been a Fire at that time in the Room, and the Weather had been cold, the same prudential Reason eternally obliges us to have a Fire continually burning at the Altar, in the hottest Fervour of the Sun over our Heads. I am afraid this Move of yours
has

has intirely checkmated you, I am sure you have no saving Arguments to interpose; for, if our blessed Saviour, in Imitation of the *Jews*, put Water into the Wine, with no other Design than to cool it, the Water could be no essential Ingredient of the Eucharist, nor was the Action sacred. And how can an Action sacred, *i. e.* not done upon any religious Account, be essential to the forming the Eucharistick Matter? for, that is as much as to say, an Action not performed upon a religious Account is, at the same time, performed upon a religious Account; for my part, if the Water was not mixed upon a religious Account, I shall never fear Damnation for the prudential one.

5thly, That the Mixture was ever designed as a sacred Act by our blessed Saviour, whatever little Stress you lay thereupon, I shall think it of the greatest Importance to deny; because, if *St. Cyprian* says, that our Saviour mixed the Cup, and that this Mixture was a Type of something that first struck upon that great Father's warm Imagination, it does not follow, that the Action, because it was Allegorized, or had a new Use assign'd it by that Father, was sacred; for, if *St. Hilary* should tell you (as he somewhere does, as I remember) that our blessed Saviour's going up unto a Mountain to Preach, was a Type of our Thoughts ascending up into Heaven; it does not follow, that our Saviour's Ascending the Mountain was a sacred Action, or that we are essentially obliged to go up Hill when we say our Prayers. I conclude,
that

that we have no Evidence, of any sort, except the Evidence of Dr. *Brett*, and some Moderns, that our Saviour, if he did mix the Cup (which *Origen* expressly says he did not) that he performed it as a religious Action; and, I am sure, no Man has need to be afraid of Damnation upon any other than a religious Account.

After what has been said, you and I shall widely differ concerning the Certainty that our Saviour mixed the Cup; and then we shall have a direct Quarrel when you tell us, that we have our Lord's Command for the Mixture, Page 93, in the Scriptures, interpreted by the Tradition of the Church.

If you call the Tradition of the *Rabbins* the Tradition of the Church, you may make your best of your new Alliance with the Enemies to Christianity; for our Parts, we shall never court them to leave your Interests, but when you talk of Scripture, and of such Scripture as was never seen in the World, it's no Wonder if we are alarmed; for, if you have got new Scripture on your Side, it is our Business to inquire what Strength and Forces this Ally will bring against us.

That our Lord commanded such a Mixture, I am sure, is not a Part of our Scripture; if you have a dark Inference, it is so dark that we may grope for ever and not find it: Our Saviour gave the Cup to his Disciples; you take for granted it was mixed, and immediately conclude, that our Lord commanded the mixed Cup to be delivered after his Death.

This

This is a most remote Consequence, as I have already shewn; for, if the Water was accidentally or prudentially put in, our Lord's Command had no Regard to the Cup, as a Mixture, but as consisting of Wine; for you may as well say, that if Salt had been mix'd with the Bread, that he commanded his Followers to give the Eucharist Bread mix'd with Salt. In fine, if our Saviour had a particular Regard to the Wine, the Water accidentally mix'd did no more destroy the Nature of the Wine, than Salt destroy'd the Nature of the Bread. For this we have the Evidence of several Passages in the Scriptures, where Wine is mentioned barely as Wine, tho' we have very probable Reasons to suppose it mix'd, according to the Custom of those Countries where they are much sooner drunk than *Europeans*, and their Wines are much stronger.

You confess, *p. 95. That a Thing might be left indifferent as well as either commanded or forbidden*; and that altho' the Scriptures have left it indifferent, Tradition may then make it, or shew it to be necessary, without any Opposition to Scripture.

If the Scripture has laid down any thing as indifferent, it is a most evident Opposition to Scripture, if Tradition makes it essential; because there is a mutual Opposition between indifferent and not indifferent Things. But if the Scripture has not mention'd them in any sort, Tradition is not a Law of it self to decree
O them

them necessary, because it is only the Testimony of Men; and therefore, at the same time, can be but an human Law; they must be made necessary by a divine Law, and Tradition is no more than the Conveyance of that Law.

I cannot but discommend your Inaccuracy in treating upon Tradition so loosely, as tho' it were a Divine Law; which is in Effect saying, *Vox Populi is Vox Dei*: For how can human Testimony or human Authority constitute a Divine Law, or make Things indifferent become absolutely necessary to Salvation?

However, to humour you, I desire to know where Tradition has ever declar'd the Necessity of the Mixture; open your Mouth, and out with it. Believe, you will find your selves the first Water Essentialists in the World.

Your learned Opponent, as you represent him, p. 96, insists, *That the Writers of the New Testament could not have been expected to pass over this Usage in Silence, had it been known to be a Part of our Saviour's Institution.* To this I have in some Measure delivered my Thoughts before; nor do I find any Answer you have made to this Objection, but that every Evangelist does not alike give the same, full, perfect, and equal Account of the Institution, however they may give a full and exact Account altogether; at least, if one misses a Circumstance, as there were four, it is very improbable an
Essential

Essential should escape 'em all, especially when it was so closely connected with the Breaking the Bread, and Blessing the Cup. It is very strange that important Affair should be dropt entirely by even one, much more by all.

Your Retreat to your old Argument of the Canon of the Scripture, I barr, because it has been already answer'd, in the first Place, and is not to your Purpose in the second; for tho' every thing necessary to Salvation may be contain'd in those written Bounds which we call the Canon of the Scripture; and Tradition, if you please, shall be allow'd to prescribe those Bounds; I say, it cannot follow by right Inference, that Tradition has transmitted one Essential or Article of Faith, exclusive of those Boundaries.

As I have before given the Challenge to produce from one Instance the Essentiality of the Water, I still have a fair Opportunity of signaling my self, by overthrowing your pretended Testimony from *Justin Martyr*: For tho' I grant that Water may have been brought to the Altar, and mix'd with it to cool it; nevertheless, the Essentiality thereof does by no means follow; for there is a wide Difference between putting Water in order to cool, and making that Water an essential Ingredient of the Cup; for if I put Salt to my Porridge, in order to season it, that Salt is not an essential Ingredient of the Porridge. It is a Jest to say, Additions make essential Ingredients, unless
O 2 they

they are so powerful as to give a new Appellation to the Subject. As you have one Apothecary in your Church, if you ask his Opinion, he will tell you better; or a Chymist would extract from his Alembick much clearer Notions than ever distilled from some of your Heads. We know Quick-silver is fixed with the Fumes of Lead, and, though it loses its volatile Nature, it is called Quick-silver still; nor is this Lead, with which it is mixed, called an essential Ingredient of the Quick-silver, nor can the Water be said to be an essential Ingredient of the Cup.

Let us hear what *Justin Martyr* says to clear this Controversy: You say *Justin Martyr* testifies the Mixture to have been not only the Practice of his own time, but the Practice of the Apostolick Age. This is, indeed, a pretty free and bold Assertion, and too bold to pass uncensured.

For all that he says amounts to no more than this; *for the Apostles, in the Traditions, handed to us by them, which are called the Gospels, have delivered, that Jesus thus commanded them, taking Bread, giving Thanks, he said, Do this in Remembrance of me; this is my Body: Likewise taking the Cup, giving Thanks, he said, This is my Blood. Which the wicked Demons have also taught, by Way of Imitation, in the Mysteries of Mythra; for, that Bread and a Cup of Water is put into the Sacrifice of him that is initiated, you either know or may know.*
In

In the first Place, if the Gospels had mentioned the Mixture, this Inference might have been made from *Justin Martyr*, when there, indeed, would have been no Occasion for the same; but as the Case stands, I see no Shadow of the Mixture, unless you insist upon his Observation on the Mysteries of *Mithra*, that they put a Cup of Water into the Sacrifice of him that was to be initiated: This would make a tolerable Argument for the *Aquarii*, but a wretched one for a Mixture, unless a Cup of Water is a Mixture of Water and Wine, which it may be in one Case, *i. e.* if you put in only just Wine enough to colour the Water, in this Manner it will be Water still, and retain its ancient Name; but, however, this will do you no Service.

Justin Martyr, when he mentions this Imitation, does not confine it to Exactness; the Bread and the Cup of Water, was in Imitation of our Bread and Cup of Liquor in our Sacrifice; but why Water alone must be in Imitation of Wine and Water, rather than of Wine, is reserved to you to resolve; and till you clear it, the Memory of *Justin Martyr* pleads loudly for Satisfaction.

The very same Answer will serve your next Instance; for, whereas *Isaiab* says xxxiii. 26, *Bread shall be given him, his Waters shall be sure*; the Father refines upon this, as alluding to the Eucharist: Now, unless the Cup had been only Water, this is produced for just nothing

nothing at all. In short, I am almost afraid you will never think your self come to your Extremity, till you are declared a downright *Aquarian*. For if this Instance of the Cup offered to *Mythra* mean any thing more than a Cup of Liquor in general, without restraining it to any particular sort of Liquor, it must be Water alone, because nothing else was in it.

And, I would fain know, moreover, why a Cup of pure Water, must necessarily denote a Mixture of Wine and Water. It may certainly as naturally denote a Cup of pure Wine, by its being unmixed, as of Wine and Water, by its being Water; so that this no more proves the Necessity of a mix'd Cup in the blessed Eucharist, than the poetical Fable of *Deucalion* and *Pyrrha* does the re-peopling the World after *Noah's Flood*, in a different Manner than that of ordinary Generation: And it is no more to the Purpose than it was in the late Answerer to Mr. *Leslie*, to cite the 9th Chapter of the *Proverbs* for the Proof of the darling Mixture, and Dr. *Hammond* on the Place, who has not there one tittle about the Mixture, much less about the Necessity of it, the only thing that was to have been proved. As you both likewise appeal to Mr. *Spinckes* for the Proof of this Mixture; and because he owns the Use of it in some Places in the second Century, would have this pass for an Acknowledgment of its being certainly used by
all

all in the foregoing Age, and not only so, but farther, of the Necessity of it both then, and ever since. And, pray good Doctor, tell me what you may not prove at this Rate?

After what has been said, when the Reader finds his Expectation baffled, and the Waters he expected to quench his Thirst with, hitherto, dried up, he will pant after fresh Springs from the Fathers; but, alas! this Controversy is as dry and thirsty in that Respect as the Desarts of *Arabia*; if he can quench his Thirst with Mouthfuls of Sand, the Doctor and his Friends can supply him with Quantity to choak him.

Yet he vapours in the succeeding Paragraph, with 2 *Thessal.* ii. 15. *Therefore Brethren, stand fast, and hold the Traditions you have been taught, whether by word, or by our epistles.* The things we plead for, says he, appear to have been taught one of those Ways, at least. He conceives he had proved all the Points to answer the Pretence of universal Consent, whereas he has not one Testimony for the Essentiality of the Water more early than this present Century, and not one for the rest more early than the third at least: To which I add, that two of his Points are Centuries later than the Rest.

As to your Prayers for the Dead, in my Opinion you have Work enough upon your Hands to prove them lawful, and you may very fairly let Necessity shift; but as you must have

have both or none, I shall as briefly, as possible, discuss each in their Order.

We have no Revelation concerning the State of the Dead; God seems purposely to have drawn a Curtain between us and the Grave; nor do I know of any Communication, except by old Women at the Fire-side, when they fright the Children. We have an Assurance in the Scriptures of eternal Happiness or Misery, but in what State we are before the Day of general Distribution comes, is not declared. Repentance is a repeated Topick in the Scripture; but no Repentance is insisted upon, except of the Living, nor are we so much acquainted with our State to know whether we can there sin or not.

I need not say how impious it is to intrude into the Secrets of God; it's evident this is a Secret of the Almighty, because he covered it from us.

Prayer is twofold, Petitionary or Eucharistical: How can we pray for the Dead, unless we are sure they want our Prayers? If they should happen to be placed in a State of Tranquillity, our Labour is lost.

Prayers for the Dead are not supported either by the Scripture or by the earliest Tradition of the Church; there is no consentient Testimony of the Church as to what Condition the Souls are in, till the Day of Judgment; so that you pray for you cannot tell what; for their Refreshment,

ment, when, perhaps, they are in no Pain; for their Repentance, when their Pardon is sealed; for their Increase in Happiness, when, for ought we know, God has set them Bounds they shall not pass.

The Bible takes in a large Scope of History, and of Laws; and yet no Prayers for the Dead are mentioned there; no Sacrifices for the departed, nor Propitiation for their Sins, instituted either amongst the *Jews*, or by our blessed Saviour. Their Kings, their Prophets, and their Great Men, had no Services appointed when they were gone. *Job*, who mentions most a future State, hints upon a Resurrection, without one slight View to the Situation of his Soul between, as though it wanted Prayers or Refreshment: Where he says any thing of that State, he supposes it a Place of Rest; for he says, c. iii. 13, 14. *For now should I have been quiet. I should have slept then, had I been at rest, with kings and counsellours of the earth.* And v. 17. *There the wicked cease from troubling, and there the weary be at rest.* In his 10th Chapter, he speaks of his next State after his Dissolution, as a State of which he could give no Account, as v. 21, 22. *Before I go hence I shall not return, even to the Land of darkness, and the shadow of death. A land of darkness, as dark as darkness it self; and of the shadow of death, without any order; and where the light is as darkness.*

For my Part when I find that God has even industriously concealed from our Eyes the Condition of the Dead, it can be no duty to pray for them; it is Intrusion into God's Secrets, a Boldness that rather calls for Correction.

I am very much astonished that you should even assert its Lawfulness, because we have no Instructions to pray for Wants in the Grave; we have no Revelation that the Just need our Prayers, or that the condemned can be the Subjects of them; For those who are cut off in their Sins, are cut off from the Prayers of the Faithful: Then their final Excommunication comes, they are separated eternally from the Church of Christ, and are consigned over as Subjects to the Prince of Darkness; in such a Case our Prayers are impious, because they desire God to reverse an irreversible Decree.

If Prayers for the Dead are lawful, they must be attended with these Circumstances.

1. We must be sure that God's Eternal Sentence is not passed upon them.

2. We must be sure that they are in a State that consists with Prayers for them.

3. Our Prayers must be attended with a pious Confidence, that we ask nothing absurd: But alas! here is an inextricable Labyrinth to wander through. We are not sure of even the best of Men; for we can judge alone of outward Circumstances, which very often fail us. I need not say what sort of Prayers these must be of which we can have no Confidence; and,

and, if they should happen to be wrong, prove, if not impious, yet at best useless and impertinent.

2. By what Intelligence do we find out that they want our Prayers? Do they even send to us to desire that Favour? Do we hear their Cries, or do their Torments pierce our Ears? What do we even conjecture they want? Victuals, Drink, Cloaths or Content: A very hopeful Consideration, that the Grave shall not put an End to the Miseries of the pious Man. How foolish was *Job* to wish the Exchange of one miserable World for another!

3. We must take Care that our Prayers be not absurd; their Souls may, for ought we know, be solacing in the Shades of Paradise, while we whine and pine for them here, and shed our Tears for nought.

I conclude, you might have sent an Envoy to the other World with less Expence and Charge than into *Scotland*: If he had brought his Re-credentials, and assured us, that since this Resolution was passed upon Earth, of praying for the Dead, several Preferments had been fitted up, and that our Parents blessed the Piety of their Children, I should heartily come into your Scheme and congratulate with you upon your Discovery.

So much for the Lawfulness; but when we come to the Essentiality, Good God! how is the Point strained in our own Service in the Church of *England*? We pray for the perfect Consummation in Bliss of the Just; in this we are authorized, because we are assured of the Re-

urrection of the Just and the Unjust; and why any farther Prayers should be essential, for my Part, I cannot find. Neither Scripture nor Antiquity have revealed this middle State; Prayers for the Dead are but barely mentioned in Antiquity; we have no Proof that *Tertullian's* Oblations for the Dead were more than Eucharistical; and why these uncertain Prayers should be essential, only the learned *Reasoner* can tell: He is, indeed, for drawing away the Curtain of the Grave; he seems to have an Ambition to converse with some of his Ancestors, though to no Purpose; inasmuch as their Wants are purposely concealed from him, and his Prayers in all probability unknown to them.

O dive not into the horrid Mysteries of the Grave! *Job* has told us, it is a Land of Darkness, as Darkness it self, and how can we, with mortal Eyes, penetrate the same? No Communication can be more absolutely cut off than ours with the Dead; our Bodies are decently laid aside to moulder in the Dust; we see not the Spirit when it flies away; we cannot trace its Steps to the Regions where it goes, nor does it leave any Track in the yielding Air,

I am therefore astonished at your Essentials founded upon Conjecture and a warm Imagination; you have no Evidence, except from Popish and corrupted Liturgies, that the Dead were ever prayed for in your Manner; and how those Alterations came in, I have already shewn.

In

In short, you may cut Essentials out of Turnips at this rate; every thing that strikes vigorously upon your Fancy is an Essential, and we must swallow it under Pain of Damnation. I pray, you good Sir, do not perswade us out of our Senses, Damnation is not in your Hand; you are too rash to be trusted with so dangerous a Power. I will venture, for once to contradict you, and, if I shall be damn'd for contradicting Nonsense, Heaven is a Paradise only for Fools.

I observe one thing, that you had rather strike upon any Fundamental of Christianity, than forego your beloved Whims: You have a bold free Way of Writing, which would do better if you took therewith a little Wit; for, why should you, for the sake of Prayers for the Dead, give the Anabaptists an Handle; you know they appeal alone to Scripture, and if by Scripture they can be convicted, I know no Reason you have to indulge them so far, as to put the whole Strength of our Argument upon a wrong Bottom. Baptizing all Nations does not actually prove Infant Baptism; for then the Infants of Heathens would be intitled to Baptism as well as the rest. This is therefore no more than a Precept in general for Baptism; but the 1 *Cor.* vii. 14. Is a Text upon which I can put the whole Issue of the Controversy concerning Infant Baptism.

Your Text therefore from the *Ephesians*, is a miserable Subterfuge; making Supplications for all Saints must include the Dead. I pray,
was

was not *Enoch* a Saint? What Supplication would you make for him, who is now with God, and was never detained in the Prison of the Grave? Moreover, you should have taken the following Words to explain the preceding *Supplication for all Saints, and for me, that Utterance may be given, &c.* sufficiently shew St. *Paul* meant the Living, exclusive of the Dead; however, this is not the first time you have given the Scripture foul Play.

The learned Author defies you to produce one Commentator on your Side; here you desire to be excused: The Protestants never favoured praying for the Dead at all, and the Papists prayed for them after another Manner; what then? The Papists would have been glad to have found a Text even so much to their Purpose, as to justify praying for the Dead in any Manner; and yet not one Controversialist on their Side ever thought it worth their while to take it up; they never wanted Assiduity nor Inclination to improve all Texts of Scripture in their own Favour; and, I believe, they would have been before you.

Αἱ ὅλοι or *ἀγιοι* was peculiarly at that time appropriated to Believers; it is therefore nothing to your Purpose, whether the Departed before our Saviour's Coming, were called *ἀγιοι*, or not; the Question is, How St. *Paul* meant it here? It's plain by the Text last cited, that *ἀγιοι* were the Believers; and, if you will strain the Word *All* to extend it even to the dead Believers, I shall

shall bestow a few Words to shew your Judiciousness and Propriety in this Case.

Where-ever the Scripture speaks of all Men, it must necessarily mean the Dead as well as the Living : This is such sublime Criticism as perhaps never appeared in the World so publicly before, nor supported either by the Classics or by Christian Divines ; neither has the Word *All* such an absolute Sweep, as to carry every thing with it, but 'tis confined to that Reference it has to the thing about which we speak ; and, as we live in a World by ourselves, All has no Liberty to travel into another without express Licence : We have no Trade or Commerce with the Dead, and therefore our Language must not mix with theirs. All was therefore never before permitted to take in the Dead, till Dr. *Brett* and his Principal opened this new World to us ; I wish them much Joy of their Discovery, and think they ought to have it for their Pains.

Surely it shews Barrenness of Argument when you take up with such poor Stuff as this. St. *Paul*, in his Epistle, frequently calls the Christians *αγιος*, Holy or Separated, which we translate Saints. In this cited Chapter, in his Epistle to the *Ephesians*, he insisted upon all the Duties we owe to the World, and concludes, that we should offer up our Prayers for all Christians, or *αγιος*, particularly for himself, that God would give him Utterance to preach the Gospel with Success. This the Doctor will have to be Prayers for

for the Dead, because, says he, All must include the Dead as well as the Living; I need not say how trifling this is, too low even for a Papist to take up.

However, you are resolved to stick close to your Topick to the last Extremity, or you would never deny the plainest Facts recorded in Scripture; the Bodies of the Saints which arose at our Saviour's Crucifixion, with your Wand, after they have made their Appearance a little while in the Dark to fright Folks, you have conjur'd down again into their Graves; they only were started up to make a Show at our Saviour's Passion, as you and your Companion will have it; but there was no vital Union between their Souls and their Bodies; the Bodies were, indeed, in Appearance awake, though, in Reality, they were stone dead, and tumbled down again into their Graves without knowing what they had done.

This Dance of dead Bodies is very prettily calculated for the Stage, tho' very inconsistent at the same time with the Account given in the Scripture. You both were pleased positively to deny the vital Union of the Soul and Body; yet the Scripture expressly says, *That the Bodies which had been asleep arose*. In what manner Bodies could arise from the Sleep of Death, without a Re-union of their Souls, is to me strange, unless we put the Story upon a Level with the Witch of *Endor*.

But the Impiety does not stop here; there is a Flight beyond all to come. None, say ye,
of

of *Adam's* Descendants are to expect a Resurrection, till our Saviour's coming to Judgment. It would be proper to ask first, if our Saviour was not a Descendant of *Adam*? So here is plain Heresy discover'd already. In the second Place, I ask what became of the Relations, of the Prophets in the Old, and our Saviour and his Apostles in the New Testament, raised from the Dead? What became of *Lazarus*? Were his Friends deluded, and did his Sisters, instead of a Brother, embrace only a Ghost?

This is indeed making the Scripture a pretty Farce? Do you imagine our blessed Saviour and his Apostles only came into the World to play Tricks, and to put Ghosts into People's Hands, instead of their Friends and Relations?

I have laid it down formerly, and do now insist upon it, that to contradict any plain Matter of Fact recorded in Scripture, is Heresy; for it is as much as to say, the Holy Ghost lies; which overturns from the Foundations, all the Authority of the Sacred Writ: How you will escape the direct Charge of Heresy upon you, I long to hear in my next.

Poor little Church! thy Existence will scarce rival for Time with a Jack Lantern, to dance about the Meadows for a while with a pretty dazzling Light, and then to fall into a Puddle of Heresy, and there be extinguish'd. I lament thy sudden and inglorious Fate! You are like Candles, those who have light you up, have put you out again.

I shall leave this Topick till I hear what you can say in your own Defence; it's too material a Point to be easily forgiven, and you must expect to hear more of it before you dye.

Again, Page 113, 115. you attack the Canon of Scripture; you say it has not the best Evidence of which a Thing is capable, because it has only human Evidence. Perhaps you are not a competent Judge what Evidence they had in those Times for the Books of Scripture. The Originals were carefully preserv'd, and St. *Ignatius* had seen them. In whose Hands they were preserv'd, is another Question. They might be carefully kept by St. *John*, for ought you know; and after the Apostles Deaths, what Divine Evidence you would have for them beyond, I cannot tell, unless you would have them preserv'd by Angels; and for the same Reason, they ought to have been so kept to this Day. For my Part, I ever acquiesce in any moral Evidence of Revelation, I shall not require God to speak in Person.

As to your Mountebank Pretences to universal Tradition, you may as well pretend to universal Knowledge. You call it universal, because it is all you have; tho' I appeal to you, whether one plain Assertion from St. *Irenæus* or *Ignatius*, that Water is essential to the Eucharistick Cup, would not be worth all you have yet produc'd? What Joy would there be amongst you, if an ancient Manuscript should arise as well attested only as your Liturgies with such a Citation, you would certainly value it more dearly

ly than Gold; and yet there are no Degrees in Universality.

You say you have the same Evidence for your Points as we have for the Canon of the Scripture.

I shall just bring the Canon of Scripture to Mr. *Leslie's* Marks, and then examine your early Testimonies.

Books of Record to which Recourse may publickly be had, kept by Persons against whom we have no Exception, have certainly the compleat Evidence of the four Marks. We have nothing to suppose, but that the Apostles deliver'd those Books into faithful Hands; whether they were all preserv'd in one Place, or not, which they might be, for any thing you know to the contrary, undoubtedly Copies went abroad thro' the World, of these Originals. Mens Eyes and Ears were Judges of the Consent with one another, and such an unanimous Scripture has been transmitted to our Hands, distinguish'd by such Means from the false ones put forth by the Hereticks of those Times.

For Instance, while our Acts of Parliament printed and our Rolls agree, there can be no Dispute of their being genuine. Even *Keeble* and those before him had bound up and published what we may without Impropriety term the Canon of the Statute Law.

In short, Laws can never be forg'd while they are publick, and in Force; the Eyes and Ears of so many concern'd are the best and

surest Guardians and Evidence at the same time. Therefore, to say we have no earlier Evidence than *Justin Martyr* for the Canon of the New Testament, is false; because every Fact attended with the four Marks necessarily traces it to the Beginning: For you may as well say, we have no Evidence of the Canon of the Statute Law, because we hear of no Evidence of such a Canon before *Rastal*, *Poulton*, or *Keeble*; whereas all the Books of the Scriptures were as fully known, before they were made one Collection, as since. *Tertullian*, as an Author, recounts them, and so might any one else.

What Evidence *Justin Martyr* is for your Mixture, I have already shewn, and to forget the Oblation in that Account, was unpardonable.

How can *Tertullian* be a Witness for Prayers to the Dead? The Oblations for, and Commemorations of the Dead, might be no more than Prayers of Thanksgiving, and a grateful Remembrance of the most eminent Martyrs and Confessors in the Martial List of Christian Heroes.

To bring therefore your Points to the Test of Mr. *Leslie's* Marks, I shall shew wherein they fail, and the Possibility of their being erroneous.

As to the Mixture, there is no Evidence, that the Institution commenc'd immediately from the Celebration of the Eucharist; for neither the Evidence for the Fact appears on that Side
of

of the Question, nor does the Nature of the Thing necessarily suppose it.

If *Justin Martyr* may be allowed an Evidence on your Side, he did not commence one till above an Hundred Years after the Institution. His living so near, as you insist upon, the latter End of *St. John's* Days, is nothing because there was Disuniformity in Practice, even in the Apostolick Age, as particularly about the Celebration of *Easter*.

Neither does the Nature of the Thing necessarily suppose it, because every Man's Eyes and Ears are not in every Corner at the same time, and they are Judges therefore of no more than what is done within the Sphere of their Senses. In Cases of that Nature, one Man might introduce Water into one Congregation, and another Chrism, &c.

Thus all the Errors of Popery have stole upon us: But if we examine the *Jewish* Passover, that's the most certain and lasting Evidence of the Truth of the Bible, that can be, because all the People were Witnesses thereof: There could be no Point of Time assign'd between the Evidence and the Institution.

Your other Points are not even so early, and therefore the same Answer will serve them; an hundred and fifty Years is a large Space of Time: No Religion ever kept an equal and uniform Face together so long since the World began. The same Number of Years gathered Corruption enough in Popery to be launched and discharged, if we consider only the eighth
and

and ninth Centuries. Invocation of Saints began in very early Times, even as early as any you can produce for Prayers for the Dead, if you will allow me to have shaken off *Tertullian*, for which I shall use no Intreaties nor Prayers. In short, Error can never creep in with the four Marks, because it ever steals into a Church unawares: But in that Case it is immediately descried. It would have been very absurd if an *Israelite* had started up, who was alive at the Institution of the Passover, and the passing the Red Sea, and should have told the People *Moses* was a Knave, and impos'd upon them; that they pass'd thro' no Sea, and were only in a Dream. Now indeed a Freethinker may laugh at the Story at such a Distance; but then he would have found a cool Reception, tho' *Moses* was far from being a popular Man.

Upon the whole, your Tradition may be false, and the very Possibility thereof destroys the Certainty and Evidence absolutely necessary to a Rule of Faith.

Moreover, I would have you observe, I have been now disputing barely upon the Matters of Fact; if we come to their Essentiality, we have a new Field to draw up our Forces in. For this you must have Evidence, either from the Nature of the Things, or from some publick Revelation, that they are essential, tho' practised. I observe you have not the least external Evidence on your Side, nor one Father or Council that ever so said.

From

From the Nature of the Things no such Conclusion can be drawn.

As to the First, *viz.* upon the Mixture, I have already been copious, and I shall here add one or two Observations more.

You say, the Eucharistick Matter is essential to the Sacrament; you have not yet defin'd what you mean by the Eucharistick Matter; for you do not mean Matter in the same Manner disposed as the Eucharistick Elements were by our blessed Saviour, because he gave the Bread unleavened, which you think does not oblige us. I would therefore ask, if Bread affected moderately with a Mixture of any other Substance, continues Bread still, and a proper Subject for the Eucharistick Sacrifice? Why may not Wine continue the same, notwithstanding its Mixture with a little Water to cool it? What Evidence have you, that Water is a more essential Part of the Eucharistick Sacrifice, than our Ferments, which in these Days we put into our Bread? Here the Foundation of Essentiality is sapp'd, and your chimerical Scheme, like Houses built by Children with Cards, comes inoffensively about your Ears. You have at the best but very slight Proof that the Mixture was practised; and that it was an essential Ingredient, not the least Shadow of Proof.

2dly. As to your Prayer for the Dead, I shall observe, that Mr. C. supposes we all live in one World, and therefore in Charity, we ought to pray for them, and they indeed, more strongly are obliged to pray for us; for
we

we cannot tell their Wants, though they may give a near Guess at ours, if their Memories continue good. Invocation of Saints is by this time just at the Door, and, if it has not made its Entrance, it's owing to the Negligence of your two Reverenceships in not introducing it; for, if there is such a charitable Intercourse betwixt us, I cannot see why we may not desire their Prayers as well as they ours; and we may presume, their Interest is more advanced after their State of Purification than ours can be.

That not praying for the Dead, according to Mr. C. is a Schism, cannot be easily granted, unless Want and Sin are essential to a Church; for, we must pray either for the Forgiveness of their Sins, or for the Supply of something they want: We are said to be in Communion with all the Saints in the Universe, as we are in the same Church, but we are not in Communion with all the Dead, for Death separates the wicked Man, both from the Presence of God, and of the World; we may therefore possibly, or not improbably, pray for these with whom we are no longer in Communion, and therefore Prayers, for the dead have no Relation to Schism, or to Catholick Communion.

No Prayers in general can be adapted to the Condition of the Dead, because no Prayers can be so contrived, which hit all their Cases; some are, undoubtedly, damn'd; our Prayers for them cannot be consistent with the Condition of those who expect, if they have not the Fruition

tion of God: Particularly Prayers cannot be formed unless we knew their particular Circumstances.

Charity is the Bond of Christian Communion; if I wish the Dead an happy Time, so far as is consistent with the Justice of God, I have nothing more to do, but to say, that unless I pray for them, I am not in Communion with them, is to say that I am not in Communion with a Catholick in *India*, if I do not know his Name, or particular Circumstances in the World; whereas Communion is being in Subjection to Christ, and you may as well say, that I am not in a State of Subjection to my lawful Prince upon Earth, unless I interceed with him to pardon every Criminal who comes into a fair way of being hanged.

Surely nothing can be more lamentable than to see Great Men prostitute their Learning and Parts to serve a bad Cause; how awkwardly they act their parts, and seem ashamed even of the Cause they pretend to own.

So much for your Prayers for the Dead; as to your Oblation and Invocation, I shall couple them together.

That the Eucharist is a Sacrament as it is, an outward Sign of inward Grace conferred, I grant, and that it is an Eucharistick Sacrifice of Prayers and Thanks, appears by all the Marks of Probability in the World; but if we make it a Repetition of that grand Sacrifice once offered for the Sins of the World, or if we make it any wise propitiatory, or a Representa-

tation of Christ's Body and Blood, we must then lay down these following Positions or Consequences.

If the first, then our blessed Saviour's Death was not a full and sufficient Sacrifice for the Sins of the World, his Propitiation extended only to those who were gone before, or to those who were then alive, and to them no farther than the present time : This we must grant, or the Repetition could not be of absolute Necessity.

Secondly, If it is a Representation of Christ's Body and his Blood, we must make it only a representative Sacrifice, otherwise we fall into the former Absurdity, that Christ is more than once offered for us ; that we crucify him whenever we consecrate the Elements ; whereas we have the consentient Testimony of Scripture, that he once died for all Men, and that we all enjoy the Benefit of the Remission of our Sins by his Death, and by that only Death of his upon the Cross.

I lay down therefore the Differences between the propitiatory Sacrifices of the *Jews*, and that of ours, to differ, in this Respect. Every Repetition of their Sacrifices was an Action *de novo* ; our Sacrifice in the Eucharist is only one and the same with that upon the Cross ; it is absurd therefore to say, that Christ is more than once offered up, or, that there is any fresh Propitiation for our Sins by the Eucharist ; Forgiveness, indeed, and Grace, may follow the worthy receiving the same but to represent

represent it with all the Circumstances of a new compleat Sacrifice, is not supported by Antiquity, in what exalted Straints soever the Fathers might speak of the same upon the Account of its Representation.

I am apt to believe ye have no adequate Notion of our blessed Saviour's Sacrifice, or, that ye never considered the same when ye talk at this Rate, which borders upon two Heresies at once.

As to the Invocation of the Holy Spirit, it is framed in Terms very offensive to tender Ears: That the Spirit attends with his Grace upon the worthy Receivers of the Eucharist, I am very apt to believe; but this Invocation, as it is worded, assigns an Office to the Spirit unknown before. But this proceeds from a Corruption of invoking the Spirit to overshadow the Elements, and to send down his Grace upon the worthy Receivers, which they, by Degrees, favoured by the Example of Popery, have turned into a Work of converting the Elements: A very proper Turn for the Transubstantiators, but unhappy for, us, if we were such Fools as to use it. To make it to us the Body and Blood of Christ, is more explaining what the true Sense is, because it seems to beg only, that it may have the same Effects to us as though it were the Body and Blood of Christ, which is the only primitive and orthodox Sense it can bear.

But you, in making it essential, tread hard upon Popery; for, if it must be a Sacrifice,

and there can no Sacrifice without that Invocation, there can be no Sacrifice without the Conversion, which I can never believe, because to substitute one Body to represent another, requires no Conversion, nor, indeed, any Actual Invocation; for, the Consecration is the very Act of Substitution, and the real, uncorrupted and pious Invocation, that the Spirit would attend the Mystery, may be a very pious and inoffensive Prayer, if it does not border upon that insnaring and dangerous Word Conversion.

I cannot see why here is not an absolute representative Sacrifice instituted, even though the Invocation is omitted; here is all the Action, of which the Evangelists have given an Account, pursued; and I have shewn from what a Corruption your pretended Invocation springs: And thus, dear Sir, I conclude with this Observation, that I am perfectly astonished that my old Friends, whose Learning, and whose Piety I once admired, should so rashly form a Separation of the greatest Consequence and Hazard, upon such slight Accounts, before they had half considered what they had been doing; as though Separations were of an indifferent Nature, and might be play'd with. I am far from insulting you upon your Misfortunes, or your wrong Steps: I am in more Pain for your immortal Souls, than ye are for your selves. I am very sorry to find, that Learning, Piety and Integrity are all too weak to resist a Foible, a Pique, or foolish Discontent, because you could not govern.

I can-

I cannot but observe, with Indignation, your setting Boys upon Mens Shoulders, and crying them up and down in Print, *A Deacon, a Deacon, a Deacon,* and then modestly require a Learned and Reverend Man to stoop to beg his Pardon, is a Flight that keeps an equal Pace with all your late Transactions. Of Mr. *Deacon* I have very little personal Knowledge, some of his Writings I have just cast my Eye upon, without much Regard, and, for the future, shall shew less; his Youth ought rather to be corrected than indulged: I know well how far this indulging has been carried, even to Heights not fit to be nam'd, of which I sent you, in a Letter, a particular Instance, to which you never had the Civility to ask my Pardon, or excuse the Fact.

As to what you ask from *Justin Martyr*, I have before sufficiently exposed it as a false Representation; for you should never quote a Father according to the Strength of your own Inferences, but according to what he plainly lays down, you have often failed in this Respect, even to a Scandal.

You are pleased to tell us how you happened to be a Nonjuror; I shall not make any barbarous Reflections upon you; Repentance may overtake even old Age; but if you pretend, that as soon as you had studied or considered the Point, you commenced one, permit me to say, I know other things by Letters under your Hand; your Conscience, you owned then, was heartily squeezed, upon the Account of the Abjura-

Abjuration Oath, twenty Years, very near, past.

But, however, I have nothing to say to that, I only wish your last Part of your Life had been uniform, exactly equal to my Opinion of you at *Springrove*. In the mean time I shall take Care to pray for you, and the rest of your fallen Brethren, that you may all become truly sensible of your Errors, and that at length our Church, may be the Joy of the whole Earth, by an Union of all those who profess themselves Christian, in one Bond of Peace, Charity and Love; and so I rest

Yours,

M. E.

6 AP 58



A LET

A
LETTER

T O

The AUTHOR of a late Pamphlet,
ironically intitled,

Mr. Leslie's Defence

FROM SOME

Erroneous and Dangerous Principles, &c.

By MATTHIAS EARBERRY, *Presbyter of
the Church of England.*

L O N D O N:

Printed by N. MIST in *Great-Carter-Lane*, and sold
by *A. Dodd* without *Temple-bar*. 1720.

LETTER

TO

The Author of a late publication
topically intitled



FROM

Printed and Published by

J. M. L. & Co. Stationers, 10, Abchurch Lane, London, E.C. 4.

Printed by J. M. L. & Co. Stationers, 10, Abchurch Lane, London, E.C. 4.



(2)

A
LETTER

To the AUTHOR of
Mr. Leslie's Defence.

SIR,



I F I had not been engag'd in a Correspondence with Dr. *Brett*, who claim'd the Respect of an old Friend, I had sent you a few Lines much sooner. I am satisfied you cannot take it ill from my Hands, if I paid my Compliments to him first.

I must needs say, no Man was ever more heartily concern'd at the fatal News of your Separation, than my self: I thought God had sent an avenging Angel amongst his own People;

ple; that surely thirty Years had not refin'd us from our Dregs, or at least, that the new Must had spoilt us quite. Upon second Thoughts, I am not so much concerned as at first; with you I hope the *fomes peccati* is gone, and I pray God we may never meet again with such an Accession of ill Humours, to poison and corrupt the most Christian Profession in the World.

If you borrow'd Mr. *Leslie's* Mask with which he used to conceal himself from the Fury of a *Scandalum Magnatum*, you have used it to a treacherous End, to abuse the most deserving Man, in several Respects, now alive. But this indeed is your levelling Principle, you pluck the grey Hairs from the aged Head, and invest Boys with the Ensigns of Authority and Reverence; and I hope you will pardon me, if I say, your whole Scheme is only a Play of Boys, who will never be Men, with old Men turn'd Boys.

I saw your Letter mention'd Page 2. with my own Eyes, and whatever Copy has been published to the World, the Author does expressly say the same with Mr. *Leslie*, that you had other things to press, which you reserv'd to a farther Opportunity. Moreover, the Penman wrote with a most inconsistent Pen; in one Place he denied the Essentiality of the Points expressly, and in another, he asserted them, according to an old Proverb, *L— have short Memories.*

It is really a pretty Stratagem to carry Articles of Faith in your Sleeves, as Pope
Hilde-

Hildebrand did Fire. However, Articles of Faith, and Essentials are dangerous things, and carried too near may singe. You may as well pretend to keep the Keys of Purgatory, as that God has intrusted you with Secrets of that Nature.

Mr. *Leslie's* Concern for the Liturgy was surely just, and not in the least inconsistent with an Observation on a Fault which was evidently no Fault of the Compilers, but of the Intruders. Our Saviour has given those Princes a Lesson, *Luke xiv. When thou art bidden of any Man to a Wedding, sit not down in the highest Room, lest a more honourable Man than thou be bidden of him.* For I must really deliver my Opinion, that Spiritual and Temporal Honour are different things; nor can the highest Titles give a Man Place in the Church, or in the Prayers: But however, this has no Relation to asperse Mr. *Leslie*, who modestly stands up in Defence of a Liturgy which cannot help these things.

'Tis you he reflects upon, who pick Holes in her as Friends, such as our Enemies could never find, who would reform her by Popish and corrupted Liturgies, drench'd in all the Ignorance of a barbarous and bigotted Age.

Is it not a pretty Prospect to see the finest Manufactures and most curious Tapestries eaten by Rats, to see the Threads pluck'd out, and the whole Beauty spoil'd by mischievous Teeth, which cannot be fram'd to work, but only to devour. But this has been our Case. If indeed our Liturgy had been torn in Pieces by

Men of Merit, Sense, or Learning, equal to the Compilers, as nothing can claim Perfection here below, we should have been more easy; but indeed ye have dealt barbarously with our old Confessors, Martyrs, and great Men, and often ignorantly too, as I have shewn in my Letter to Dr. *Brett*.

To see a magnificent Pile, which has stood the Envy of its Neighbours, blasted by Lightning, is a cruel Spectacle. But tho' Lightning strikes the highest Summits, Envy can reach as high, and stoop as low; its contagious Blast destroys all it comes near.

But is it a Fault because our prudent Reformers have raz'd out all the Marks and Footsteps of Popery turn'd out the Invocation, because it was superstitiously perverted to favour a Conversion of the Elements, laid aside the Oblation because it was unnecessary, rejected Water, because it is not supported by Scripture, and turn'd the Stream of Prayers for the Dead, from Superstition, to a true pious and inoffensive Sense; for these she is become your Enemy. Was not Transubstantiation the most formidable Monster of Popery? And if we sent it home with its Retinue, surely they will never be permitted to enter again.

Let me take the Freedom to tell you, that you do not understand the Scope of Mr. *Leslie's* Argument. He does not run down Tradition, and the Authority of the Fathers; he insists, that their Testimonies cannot come up to his eight Marks, in relation to this Controversy: I shall

shall therefore set him for your Information in a clear Light,

If you would prove the Essentiality of your Points from the Practice of the Church, or a Passage or two in the Fathers, you must fail, because this does not prove the Practice universal; things that in their own Nature carry a perpetual Obligation with them, if they can be proved to have been practised by one Part of the Catholick Church, it must follow, of Course, that the Practice was universal; to prove the Universality from the Essentiality, is quite different from proving the Essentiality from the Universality, because in the last Case you must bring your Testimony from all the Churches in the World at the same time; and this was the Meaning of *Vincentius Lyrinensis's* Rule; for you, can never prove the Universality of a Practice from one, or two, or three Churches, unless the Points were Essential; and this would bring you into a Circle.

The Observation of *Easter* is a plain Evidence on Mr. *Leslie's* Side; different Apostolick Practice brought two different Traditions into the World, neither could be universal, and yet if, by Injury of Time, according to you, one Tradition had been stifled, or not recorded in History, the other would have been essential.

The Customs therefore of Churches may very well be different, or they may be uniform, and yet it does not follow logically, that in either Case they are essential; *Lyrinensis's* Universality therefore has no Relation to your
Pra-

Practices, but to things of an essential Nature, as is the Observation of the Lord's Day, and the Abolition of the Sabbath: Here one Instance from a Catholick Church is a full Proof for Universality.

I do not believe the Apostles laid a Weight upon Trifles or crowded into Religion more Essentials than were absolutely requisite in the Nature of the things. If, indeed, Transubstantiation had been true, two of your Points come in Course, otherwise they ought to be rejected. If the Apostles in Council unanimously agreed upon an exact Uniformity of Worship to be observed alike, in all the Churches, this would have appear'd; at least, *quod non apparet non est*, it might very well be supposed Varieties of Churches disjoined by Seas, or Desarts, might have different Customs.

Nor does Mr. *Leslie* fix a Brand upon all the Fathers; he only sets you to work to examine what Works are genuine, and what are not; because you seem to swallow all things you find, with an implicate Faith; nor can your Party shew their Inaccurateness more, and want of Criticism, than Dr. *Erett* has done in his late Edition of the Liturgies. Surely you may very well know supposititious Works in the Fathers have been imposed before ever the *Romish Index Expurgatorius* came forth: Nor did that take so much of the Chaff away as the Wheat: *Pseudo-Fathers* still keep up their Faces with tolerable Assurance in their Church, and never fail to be usner'd in with all Formality by their Writers;

Writers; nay, if the Impostors had been but Men of tolerable Sense, had laid their Stories well together, and not crowded in the Terms of one Age into the pretended Writings of another, they might still have past uncontradicted, we must have pulled off our Hats to these Idols of our Enemies setting up; and whether still we have not some of that Trash amongst us, is more than we infallibly know. We have no Writings that have passed untouch'd through their Hands; the Scripture is indeed Oar which will always be known, because it is an universal Book, as our Statutes are; but the Fathers, who came into few Hands, and were, moreover, only Manuscripts, what Assurance can you pretend to have, that even their Works, quoted by you are all genuine?

You might therefore have spared your Labour of your fine pedantick Catalogue of Works of the Fathers, printed before the *Ignis Expurgatorius*, the Work of a whole Club of Bookfellers and Authors.

Pardon me, dear Sir, if I do not take all this Letter to be your own; the poor Brat has got as many Fathers as it has Ears, Feet and Toes; however, as you generously assume the Protection of the Brat, you shall be the Father, how many soever have lain with the Mother. It were easy to tell who seems to have given the first Strokes; and here a Man may see the Finger of *Ballard* or *Noel*; you shall never persuade me, that all these Editions, or half lie in your Master's Warehouse. I would have all the tolerable

rable Reason to hope from your aspiring Genius, that after a Conquest over the Reformers of the Church of *England*, and over even the Church it self, you will not stop at a few Fathers, but, in time, compleat your Conquest there likewise.

You are pleased to endeavour to weaken, if not absolutely to overthrow, the four Marks; I crave leave to be heard as a Counsel in their Defence.

As to the first; how, say you, shall we be certain without Tradition, that there were such Facts at all? Alas poor Man! Mr. *Leslie* lays this down as a Supposition, that they are of such a Nature that Mens outward Senses are Judges, otherwise the Facts are not capable of being brought to the Test of the succeeding Marks.

As to the second, say you, how can the Certainty appear to us, to have been publickly done? Why, dear Sir, this will appear to us as plainly as to them, if we attend the two following.

As to the third, you say, we have no certain History of these outward Institutions, if Tradition is uncertain: Yes, our Certainty arises from these Institutions and Monuments, having a publick and evident Existence at a time when History it self has all the Marks that attest the Existence of those Monuments.

As to the fourth, we cannot, you say, be certain, that ever the Facts were done, or that the Institutions began immediately from the Facts; I answer, we are sure of that, if the Institutions had a close Connection with the Facts, and
were

were so publick, that there could be no Distance of time, in which they began, after the Facts which would not to all the World have declared the Imposture. I shall fix upon the *Jewish* Passover as an Instance which cannot fail to stand the Test. The Nature of this Fact was so publick, that 600,000 Peoples Eyes and Ears were Witnesses to it, and to the Occasion.

2. The Certainty appears to us, because we have certain Evidence it appeared to them.

3. We are certain of the Institutions because we are certain those Institutions existed at the Siege of *Jerusalem*, when there was Unanimity in the Accounts of History, and Mens Eyes and Ears were Judges of the Truth of that History, and believed it.

4. We are certain the Institutions began immediately from the Facts, because they could not commence, sometime after, without giving the Lie to themselves, and declaring the Imposture to all those concern'd, whose Eyes and Ears were Judges of the Institutions, and whether they immediately followed the Facts or not.

These are the four Chief, the other have either a greater or less Dependence upon these; the fifth, particularly, has all the four Marks; the sixth, as to the Verity of the Prophecies, requires the four Marks; the seventh is a kind of Prophetick Relation, though under the Name of Types and Resemblances; and, the eighth is a Mark drawn only from charitable Probability; and, I hope, I have given you

T

Satis-

Satisfaction as to the Marks. Mr. *Leslie*, I grant, does not say, but that a Matter of Fact may be true without his eight Marks: But, he says, *Truth of Christianity Demonstrated*. Page 58. That no Fact with the four Marks can be false; and therefore the Difference is vastly wide of your Tradition, which because it may be false, cannot be the Foundation of Essentials; but ours may, because it cannot be false. Religion must not be built upon an Uncertainty; what may be false can be no Object of Faith or religious Obedience, though it should happen to be true at the same time.

As to the Fathers, as far as relates to your Controversy, I shall bring their Evidence to only five Marks, because no more are immediately necessary in this Dispute.

Every Man's Eyes and Ears are not Judges of the universal Practice of the Facts supposed to be recorded by them, because new and different Customs may arise in different Churches.

They are not Evidences that the Facts were done openly and publickly in the Apostolick Age, because they did not live in those Days; moreover, Dr. *Brett*, in his Discourse upon Liturgies, and in other Tracts, has laid it down for granted, that the Christian Worship was a Mystery, and divulged to none but a few; so that one Church could not tell what the other was doing.

The outward Institutions do not appear to have commenced immediately after the Facts, because

because from what has been said, they were not publick enough to have been so attested.

The Writings of the Fathers never were a Statute-Book, nor a Law to the Primitive Church; for then, they would have been preserved as publick Records to be seen by every one; they would have been as carefully preserved as the Scriptures, and we should not have seen so many spurious Additions; for, all Nations and People are careful of their Laws. The Old Testament was preserved even to a Tittle, and, it is impossible to add a forged Statute to *Keeble*, or one Book more of Institutes to Sir *Edward Coke*, than he wrote.

Yet how has *Ignatius* been mangled and torn by Impostors? Nor has even St. *Clement*, Companion to St. *Paul* in his Labours, escaped their Fingers. *Tertullian* is a Jumble of Heresy, and Catholicism. It does not appear that the Church ever selected his orthodox Writings, and settled them for a Law to the Church; insomuch that it is even difficult to know, and has been reserved to our modern Criticks to find out, what Books were written by him, when a Heretick, and what were not. How hard this falls upon you, when we consider he is your first Legislator for praying for the Dead, and a *Montanist* into the Bargain.

I pray consider, whether they were ever appealed to as Legislators in the fifth or sixth Centuries, St. *Cyprian*, indeed, loved *Tertullian* and studied him, but he loved him as

Squirrels do Nuts, for the fake of cracking: He was a Heathen Lawyer tho' a Christian.

You are not pleased at Mr. *Leslie's* Objection, that all the Churches had not so fair an Opportunity of corresponding as now, and that the particular Customs and Usages had not so free a Circulation. Upon this, after your usual Method, you insult; Mr. *Lesly* proves but an awkward Sailor, and you set him right with a long Detail from Dr. *Prideaux*, how *Solomon*, *Pharoah*, and *Ptolomy*, sailed long before our Saviour was born. Mr. *Leslie* did not deny, that there were Ships in those Days, and that the Christians, who originally came from one Spot of Ground, must have some Means to get to those Places; for they did not ride upon Switches through the Air; but, his Meaning was, that Navigation to all Parts of the World was not so ready, so open, and so frequent as now: Moreover, Commerce has a much stronger Footing in the World than it ever had, because the Enemies to the *Roman* Empire were in a perpetual War against her, which was a perpetual Stop to a free and easy Communication; whereas *India* now is, in a Manner, a bordering Country even upon *Britain*, and the Czar has a Trade from the *Baltick* to *China*. I observe you have taken a particular Care to secure a Commerce with the *Red Sea* and *India*; nay, you have helped the *Greeks* to a tolerable Share of Trade; but then you do not consider, what is called there the Western Part of the World, is termed so in respect to the *Indies*; whereas

whereas it is the Eastern to us; of whose Interests you seem not to have the least Regard. A Christian Church was planted in *Britain*; what Provision have you made yet, with your Navigation, for your own Native Country? She seems very little concerned with a Fleet 2000 Years ago in the Streights of *Babel-mandel*.

However, it does not appear, that the Fathers were Merchants; or that they exactly maintained a Correspondence with all Parts of the World where Ships could sail or Men could travel by Land. Indeed, in our own times, such a Correspondence is more easy to be had, because we have almost settled Posts from one Extremity of the World to another; but then, Fleets to the *Indies* did not go so often, and, when they did, they had something more weighty to freight their Ships with than your Essentials.

You say, in those Times the Christians had Letters communicatory; but, do you imagine these Letters went Post, or were conveyed by Pigeons to all Parts of the World; these Letters were only for immediate Service of Travellers, and would hardly feel their Feet from *Antioch* to *Babelmandel*.

Old primitive Practice, meerly of it self alone, has no Weight, says Mr. *Leslie*: Yours are primitive Practices founded upon Scripture; I pray, why then do you set up Tradition as a Rule by it self? In short, your Tradition is a meer Beggar, it can with or without
Crutches

Crutches, according to its Convenience; sometimes it cannot stand without Scripture, and, again, it gets upon its Legs, and bids Defiance to its first Supporters.

You may dwell, if you please, upon what Mr. *Leslie* has said in his *Rehearsals*; you will find he speaks of Facts which have the Testimony of the four Marks; neither does he say, that there are any such Facts in Relation to Essentials not recorded in Scripture, but that if there were, such Testimony would give them absolute Credit. This is no more than I have asserted, that God is not obliged to reveal himself one way; but if he reveals his Laws, he reveals them infallibly to us. I did not deny the Power of Tradition with the Marks, but that's a Property I forbid you to touch, it's too heavy for your Fingers; you must take up with a light Tradition. *Robin Goodfellow* and the Fairies are good Ecclesiastick History with you, supported by your Tradition.

As to the Anabaptists, what he urges to them is *Argumentum ad eos*, who insist so positively upon a plain and evident Text of Scripture just fitted to their Scruples, as though the New Testament was calculated only to guard against all the Difficulties inquisitive Men raise; whereas it is only a plain Book of Laws, and great Scope is left to the Church to interpret the same, and explain, as our Courts of Judicature explain upon our Laws. I do not refuse the utmost Deference to the most ancient Expounders, if I can find Unanimity

nimity in the Exposition, and sufficient Authority expounding the same.

Mr. *Leslie* therefore does not appeal to the Authority of the Church in all Ages, to make new Essentials or new Articles of Faith ; but when he says the *Jewish* Sabbath was abrogated, and the Lord's Day introduced in its Stead, it was not done by any except the apostolick Church ; for the Apostles alone were Legislators in those great Points, as they were inspired, and had their Authority from Christ, the Head of his own Church.

You are therefore egregiously mistaken in Mr. *Leslie's* Sense, and your own ; you fancy he has too little, and your self too much : Alas ! he was a Man in Esteem and Figure before you was a Babe of Grace, or initiated into a Christian Church.

Mr. *Leslie's* Parallel between your Spirit, and Mr. *Stephens's* was in some Measure just, and, if any, the poor Man had the greatest Injury done him : He was an honest, well-meaning Man ; and, a Notion breeding in his Head, and cherished till it came to Maturity, made him run mad in the Woods : He read of daily Communion in the primitive Church, like you, he fancied every Primitive Practice was an eternal Law, and, by this Means, without any Regard to Church Laws or Discipline, he primitively led his Congregation into *Cain Wood*, where two Religions have already made their Exits ; and, I impatiently expect to hear
of

of the third. I must needs confess, I do not love these Mushroom-Churches, they may have a bewitching Flavour when they are fresh, but after the Sun has shone upon them, and they are trodden under Foot, they are fit only to return to that original Corruption from whence they came.

As to daily Communion, I deliver my Opinion freely; if we had not run down the Sacrament to the Bottom, and then wound it up again till the Springs cracked, we should not have seen the Decay of Christian Piety in the World: But my dear Friend, temporal Laws are accommodated to the various Circumstances of Times and Things, and bringing things back to their old Station is not always practicable.

With the primitive Christians an universal Spirit of Love and Fervency prevailed; Persecution warmed their Affections, and re-kindled the Coals, though expiring almost with Intervals of Rest and Ease. Moreover, the primitive Christians had a more lively Sense of the Mysteries of Religion than we have at this Day, which caused more warm and sensible Glowings in their Books; but, in an Age like ours, more frozen, as to Piety and every thing that is good, than the Northern Pole, the Revival of such a Custom would be ridiculous to some, and terrible to others; in most Places the Sacrament would be trampled upon, and more neglected than before. You must not recover a starving
Man

Man with fleshy Feeding, his Stomach must be corrected by Degrees before it can bear wholesome Food.

However, I take it for granted from what you have said, daily Communion is your Essential Practice; that your Lamps are always prepared and trimm'd, and that Charity and Humility usher your Party to the Reception of the Eucharist. Oh! it is dreadful to tempt the Mysteries of Religion too far; the most celestial Food may turn Poison, corrupt your Bowels, and be Rottenness in your Bones.

Mr. *Leslie* therefore only bids you beware of splitting too much upon the Fondness of the Institution, without a due Regard to the Spirit and Divine Energy attending those Divine Offices. This you call Quakerism, though surely your Party's pretending to Illumination, and the second Sight, deserves Animadversions, being as Enthusiastick even as Quakerism can be. Mr. *Leslie* has lived in a Country where he has seen the *opus operatum* run away with the Substance of Piety, and of Religion; and, indeed, the same Devastation is approaching your Borders. No People lay a greater Stress upon one pretended Essential than you, while you drop others far more worthy of Regard. I do not charge you with the common Immoralities, or the beau Vices of the Age, but with other Frailties, equally detestable to God, as they can be; and, what is worse, you work them into your Devotions, and make the Eucharist the Bond of Peace,
U Chari-

Charity, and Love, turn into the Occasion of Discord: The very Bread you Break is a Token of Disunion, and your Cup, the Drink of Uncharitableness.

Pardon me, dear Sir, if I speak so harshly; it is not a Pleasure I take in your Frailties, but a Concern to see my old Companions and Friends lost for ever.

It was you who put the Contest between us upon the Foot of Heaven and Hell: You have, as much as in you lies, sunk a whole Succession of Confessors and Martyrs into one common Destruction: you have shut the Gates of Heaven upon those who first opened them to you, and received you, as Penitents, into the Bosom of the Church.

Has God turn'd his Institutions into Traps that sweep away all his Heritage by Shoals, before they know where they are? The Institutions were not made purely for the sake of being such, but they have these following Ends.

1. They are Marks of our Obedience.
2. They are Clues to direct and guide us to those Fountains of Grace God plentifully sends to water his Heritage.
3. They are Tokens or Signs of the Nature of Christianity.
4. They are outward Monuments of the most glorious Dispensations of the Gospel, which keeps them up in continual Remembrance to the End of the World, and are, at the same time, the best and strongest Proofs of

of the Verity of the Facts related in the Gospel.

Obedience to those Institutions is the indispensable Term of our Union with Christ and his Church; where they are regularly and duly performed, his Church will be to the End of the World.

That the Reality is in the Spirit which is only prefigured in the outward Institutions, is to you meer Fanaticism. I pray, consider well upon what follows in this Paragraph, *viz.* Page 28. They are not only Figures, but Conveyers of Spiritual Graces. Did not *Tertullian*, in that famed Passage against Transubstantiation, call the Eucharist a Figure? If it is only a representative Sacrifice, it is but a Figure still; and what you can make them more, consistent with good Sense, I cannot tell. They may, indeed, metaphorically, and prettily enough, be called Conveyers of Grace, because the Grace of God attends them, and is bestowed upon the use of them; but if they are in Reality more, you may as well tell me, Grace may be carried in a Wheel-Barrow, or a Hackney Coach. Do you imagine Grace goes down into your Belly when you swallow the consecrated Bread, that Sanctification is spread over the Face, when the Infant is sprinkled with baptismal Water; Grace may go along with Matter, and then Matter is the Sign of that Grace; but how Grace can be carried in Matter, is really beyond my Metaphysics to explain. I have no Notion of Grace, adhering to, or sticking in senseless Matter.

This is a new Scheme of Theology unheard of before: No Schoolmen ever insisted so nicely as this in Relation to the baptismal Waters, however they might treat upon the Eucharist where they asserted a real Presence: And, indeed, Grace certainly attends Christ wherever he is.

If the contrary to yours is the fanatical Principle, you ought to have told us, what sort of Fanatics they are, because they are ranged in different Classes; and, perhaps, if we put you into the lowermost, it is because you are the youngest Tribe.

No Fanatick ever made a more causeless Separation than you have done; none ever railed with more Vehemency against the Church; none ever took more Pleasure or Pains in finding Faults with our Liturgy and Worship; none are more conceited than you, nor pretend more to Illumination; so that, indeed, you should not have sent to the Episcopal but to the Presbyterian Church of *Scotland*, for an Alliance; they would have damned and cursed spiritually as well as your selves.

To return, I pray why has Mr. *Leslie* perverted the Sense of a Text, *Rom. ii. 28, 29.* *For he is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that Circumcision which is outward in the Flesh.* Surely his Inference from thence is right, that neither the *Jewish* nor the Christian Institutions alone were of any Efficacy without the necessary Preparatives of Piety and Virtue; if the Heart is not swept and garnished,
no

no good Angel will enter there, much less the Spirit of God ; his Temple is unpolluted, no defecrated Thoughts and Actions must be there. If you think your new Schism so meritorious as to invite the Spirit, I am afraid you will be disappointed of your Guest.

I find where you are driving into the Toil of Popery as fast as you can ; however, in the mean time I shall carry on my Speculations to your twelfth Section.

St. Peter, according to you, says Baptism is the Anti-type of the Ark, wherein eight Persons were saved from drowning ; upon this you very judiciously observe, that the Anti-type and Type are two different things ; yes they are ; but though the Ark might be the Figure of Baptism, it does not follow that Baptism might not be the Figure of something else ; so that the Sense, without Difficulty, will run thus : As the Ark shewed that eight Persons were saved by Water, so Baptism shews that we shall be saved by Water likewise joined with a good Conscience towards God, by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ ; the Ark represented Baptism alone, but then what represents a good Conscience, except the Resurrection of Jesus Christ, it must be Baptism ; so that the Ark is only a Figure of a Figure. This must be the Sense, or *St. Peter* did not speak coherently : The Type could not, in your Sense, come up to the Anti-type. To make this plain, I shall change his Words, and suppose he had delivered himself, that as Circumcision is a Figure of the Renew-
ing

ing and Contrition of the Heart, so it is a Figure of the Renewing and Contrition of the Heart joined with Baptism. This can never be good Sense, unless Baptism is a Figure of that Renewing of the Heart. There cannot therefore be a more easy and natural Interpretation of *St. Peter's* Words than the following: As the Ark, in which eight Persons were saved, was a Figure of Baptism, so is Baptism the Anti-type of the Ark, a Figure of our being saved with this Addition of a good Conscience, &c. So that, dear Sir, the Type and the Anti-type represent still Salvation obtained by their Means; you may please to consider (let the Anti-type and the Type have never so near a Regard to each other) they were still the Representatives of being saved by Water; and are both Figures consequently, which is against Hypothesis.

I call upon you, dear Sir, to define what Baptism is; it cannot be said absolutely to save us by your own Concession; it is an external Action; and if with a good Conscience, and that external Action we are saved, surely that external Action can be no more than a Sign we are saved, it is a Seal, a Pledge, a Token thereof. External Actions joined to Bargains, Covenants, and Deeds, are only Signs. Moreover, what has no inherent Holiness in it self cannot become Holy without a divine Command; in that case it has no other Sanction: Matter can have no inherent but accidental Holiness, because inherent Holiness proceeds from inward Purity and Rectitude, in
its

its own Nature; and there can be no rational End in making that absolutely Holy which is not capable of absolute Holiness; and if the Holiness is Circumstantial, it must depend upon some other Terms; the Matter can only therefore be a Sign of that thing, for whose sake it was sanctified.

I see no reason therefore to stick at asserting, that Circumcision and Baptism were not instituted for their own sakes; but to denote an inward and spiritual Meaning: This you call making the Sacrament only figurative; why, this is *Tertullian's* Definition of a Sacrament. He says, moreover, it ought not to be proposed dubiously, *non dubie annuntietur, in quod tota Salus committitur*. I am sure this strikes directly at your essential Water, at the best a most dubious and uncertain Proposition.

You seem not to have an adequate Notion what is figurative; a Figure is a Sign always attending a Reality; neither Sacrifices nor Sacraments can be any thing else. Our blessed Saviour's Sacrifice was a real one, and yet it was a Sign that our Sins were forgiven; the End of any thing is the Purpose for which it was done, and when the Action is performed it's a Sign of the End being answered. Thus our blessed Saviour died for our Sins; his Death was surely a Sign that the End of his dying was answered. Baptism was instituted for the Purpose of our Regeneration, when that Baptism is performed, it's a Sign that we are regenerated. God may command indiffe-
rent

rent things, and from that time they become necessary; but God does it with some End; and when they are performed, it is a Sign that End is a Sign or Figure; for it is, in it self, an indifferent Action; but, by being commanded by God, it becomes necessary: And surely, God had some End in commanding it, and when it is performed it's surely a Sign that End is answered. The End proposed by Almighty God, was, that with it we should have eternal Life; its but a Sign or Figure still.

The Sum therefore of your great Quarrel against Mr. *Leslie*, for which you accuse him of Fanaticism with a Freedom peculiar to your Genius, is no more than this; all outward Institutions, in their own Nature indifferent, are ordained by God for some End, and the End for which a thing is ordained is preferable to the Institution. This, surely is consistent with good Sense and Reason; he might therefore very well say, the Institution alone without the End being answered, was good for nothing, a dead Letter, a Carcase, or a Skeleton: But you immediately add, that there is an inherent Holiness in the Institutions themselves; at the same time you grant, that without the Conditions they are void, they have no Effect. And what are they joined with the additional Conditions, but Signs of the End for which they were instituted? The Man unhappily beats his own Shadow, and fancies Mr. *Leslie* feels the Blow, who has asserted nothing but what

what you must grant when you are come to your Senses from this profound Sleep.

You have treated Mr. *Leslie* in this childish Contest with much ill Manners; you suppose him to be delirious, that he forgets himself, whereas 'tis your own Face you see in the Glass. You confess, Page 31, that the outward Means are those whereby we receive spiritual Benefits; and, you approve of Mr. *Leslie's* agreeing thereto. By outward Means, is here understood Conditions; for it is the Spirit, and not the outward Means which confers Grace. And the outward Means are part of the Conditions upon which it is conferred by the Spirit of God; for how can senseless Matter bestow Grace? But God may make the Performances of an outward Institution, the inseparable Attendant to his Grace.

Pray where does Mr. *Leslie* relapse? He sticks, in my Opinion, close to his first Assertion, that outward Institutions are absolutely necessary to be observed, for two Reasons, because they are commanded, and because they are made part of the Conditions of his bestowing his Grace. Here is no Raving nor Relapsing, but all Steadiness and Uniformity; for, what can they be more than a Shell? You say Grace is conveyed in them, and if Grace is the Inside, I hope it may very properly be called the Kernel, for the Shell is a thick, tough Coat that invests the Kernel.

With you it is Fanaticism to say, the Reality is only figured in the outward Institutions.

Indeed, if Mr. *Leslie* had said, that no Grace was conferred by their Means, or upon using them, I would have immediately delivered him up as a Quaker into your Hands, and then the two Enthusiasts might have fought out their own Quarrel; but, alas! this is far from Truth: He allows them to be the Signs and Means of Grace, and, if they are Grace it self, and have an inherent Holiness, I will turn *Egyptian*, and worship Apes, Onions and Garlick: I will as soon believe a Divinity residing in either of them, as in any other Matter.

I desire to know where, and in what Manner, Mr. *Leslie* contradicts his *Snake in the Grass*? *As it was under the Law the outward was ordained, as a Means whereby we are made Partakers of the inward.* Surely this is more than making Baptism a mere Type, because a Type is not the Condition of Grace, but a Prefiguration of something which is to come: A Type has these following Uses;

1. It is a Prophecy attended with an outward Sign and Institution, to be an Evidence when the thing comes to pass.

2. It illustrates the Anti-type when it does come to pass.

3. It is an Earnest, a Pledge, or Token of God's Favour, and of some Good to come.

Therefore Mr. *Leslie* could not make Baptism only a Figure of something to come, but a Sign of something at Hand; and, if you make the Christian Institutions more, you border upon Idolatry. The same Mistake has led the
Papists

Papists into Transubstantiation, nay, it has conjured you into the same Circle before you knew where you was, or, at least, I charitably think so.

To return; Mr. Leslie says, *God has ordained, that his Gifts and Graces shall be conveyed to us by outward Signs and Means*: If he had said in outward Signs and Means, he had come pretty nearly into your Scheme; he was not so lost to common Sense (as delirious as you make him) to put Grace into Bread; for, what is Grace? You, who claim more than your Neighbours, ought best to tell: However, for once, I will tell you my Opinion of that Grace which is conveyed with the Sacrament.

Grace is taken in two Senses in the Scripture; the Signification of the Word is some Favour bestowed upon us; it's therefore,

1. The kind Assistance God sends us by his Holy Spirit to overthrow the first Efforts of Sin, in Rebellion against us, by infusing good Thoughts and just Desires.

2. It is the peculiar Dispensation of the Gospel attended with the glorious Privileges of Immortality, and being made Subjects of Christ's Kingdom.

I desire to know how Grace, in either of those Senses can be said to be conveyed in the Elements; for does the Spirit of God animate the Bread, and make it a living Substance? Can Water have a regenerating Quality, as Water, without some new Substance being added to it? If so, the Woman in the *Proverbs*

might very well wipe her Mouth, and say she had done no Wickedness. Can any one say, the Spirit dwells in and animates the Water? If not, Water is but Water still. The Spirit washes away Sin; and Water is only the Sign of that Regeneration.

Mr. *Leslie* lays down, that the Scripture alone teaches us what is Sin, because it must be clearly and evidently revealed, which is only in the Scriptures; for this he quotes *Deuteronomy*, that there was the whole Duty of the *Jews*, that they were not to add nor diminish therefrom.

Upon this you are very pert; how, say you, does this prove any thing in Favour of the New Testament?

I will tell you in a few Words, how wide your whole Party is from the Scope of the Question, as I have before observed, they have made a Separation before they understood the Principles they separated upon.

For the Question is, in what Manner the Laws of God are promulged to his People? It's therefore proper, first, to examine how they were delivered to his own People, the *Jews*; and then, to take a View how they are transmitted to us. Sin must necessarily be the Transgression of a Law: And if neither the *Jews* nor our selves have any unwritten Laws, the Scripture is the only Law to us, consequently against that only can we sin; if no other Laws appear to us infallibly revealed, the Scripture is our whole Direction, for the Reasons

sons I have before given, against Uncertainty in Laws.

But you, my dear Antagonist, who are entered upon a formal Engagement to support your own Opinions till you die, will not allow the Scriptures, even of *Moses*, to be a compleat Law to the People at that time; for, you find some Additions made to Religion by *Solomon*, who built another Altar by Reason of the Multitude of Sacrifices. This is an Observation worthy of your judicious Pen. If an Altar is an Addition to Religion, a Steeple surely ought not to be built without a Convocation. I cannot but admire how you have turned the Question out of its proper Road; which was concerning Morality and Immorality, and you have turned it to the Work of a Mason.

Were the *Jews* impowered to make essential Additions to their Law? If not, Sin was to be found still as Sin, after it was brought to the Test of the Transgression of a Law.

You have, indeed, Assurance enough to say, the Texts cited do not prove, that the whole revealed Will of God, delivered by *Moses* to the *Jews*, was a written Law; and yet they are expressly recommended, without Restriction, as a Body of Law. They are forbid to add or diminish; and, if this does not prove them a Compleat Body of Moral Laws, it was just nothing at all. Can you trace any Footsteps of a traditionary Legislature with the *Jews*, till the *Pharisaical* Days? And even our blessed Saviour condemn'd them.

I pass

I pass over your pitiful Remark on Mr. *Leslie*, concerning Episcopacy, and the Sabbath, because I have answered it before; he no where denies the Possibility of Tradition with his Marks, being a sufficient Attestation to an Article of Faith, but at the same time he asserts, that the Scripture is a compleat Rule of Faith in Fact. You cannot forbear misrepresenting Mr. *Leslie*, you give his Expressions and thoughts an aukward Turn, Page 33. The Silence of God in some Cases is a direct Prohibition; that is, where the Nature of the thing requires that he should speak if it was lawful: It's evident, the Fire of *Nadab* and *A-bihu* was called strange Fire; because it was not commanded by God in his Book of Laws. The Scripture is silent so far, as that it does not in exprefs Words forbid that another Fire should be made; and the Silence of the Scripture in that respect is a Prohibition: For where God delivers his Commands, it is supposed he delivers them fully, and the strange Fire was strange, because God had not commanded it.

As to the second Instance, I shall observe, that tho' some things may be literally forbid in the Scriptures; yet when God appeals to his not commanding it to be done, we ought to submit to his Reason as a good one, even tho' the Prohibition has not been mentioned in Scripture. I conclude, as Mr. *Leslie* has God on his Side in this Argument, he needs no better Advocate.

The same may serve for the third Instance; for tho' sacrificing our Children is forbid by the Law of God and of Nature; nevertheless, God, to aggravate the Crime, urges, that they did it, whereas he had not commanded it; and if it could have been lawful, it would have been instituted of God amongst his own People.

I observe, if you can fasten Dirt upon old Age and Merit, you never fail, tho' it leaves no Stain, and only puts us to the Trouble of wiping it off. You say, he misrepresents the Scripture, tho' I cannot find where you say, he artfully represents God, as speaking that which he never spake. He casts in the Word *Because*, tho' it has nothing to do there. *Why may I not worship the Host of Heaven? Because, says God, it is that which I have not commanded.* Surely, if God upbraids them that they worshipp'd the Host of Heaven, whereas he had not commanded it, the Absence of the Command was one Reason of the Guilt. And what Harm either to the Sense or the Words could *Because* be? For Mr. *Leslie* does not pretend to urge that as the only Reason, but as a sufficient one, or at least it was us'd by God himself in more Places than one.

It is impious to suppose, that God's Commands are tricking or deceitful, whereas they are full and plain in themselves, and in the Delivery of them to his People. The Nature of things permits minute Alterations adapted to the Accidents of Time; and therefore another Altar, when the Number of the People increas'd, was

no diminishing from, or Addition to the Body of Laws, which do not carry a direct Eye to remote Accidents. Captivities in Effect repealed a great Part of the Ceremonial Law, and yet the Body of Laws was not hurt, because Obligation never extends beyond Possibility.

Tho' whatever has been hitherto urg'd to prove the Lawfulness of the mix'd Cup from Scripture has in my Letter to Doctor *Brett* been exposed as ridiculous and impudent, I shall condescend just to touch upon your four Particulars, Page 42.

First, To compare the disputed Text with other Texts of Scripture.

You have no Proof that the Cup was mingled, from any Comparison you draw from thence; your Notions of the Fruit of the Vine you have given up as precarious; your Proof from Proverbs is the arbitrary Conjecture of Commentators, who were not infallible, and who stretch'd Prophecies till they crack'd. Moreover, the Word *imports* any thing pour'd out or mix'd, as has been prov'd. Here you make the Eucharist to be a Sign of the Lord's Death, and but just before you quarrel with Mr. *Leslie* for calling it a Sign. But this Notion of representing the Water pouring from his Side, is a Guess, and cannot be essential, because it has no Relation to compleat the Sacrifice. Lastly, as to the Water mentioned with the Blood of the old Covenant, it was a Type of Baptism, as it is every where, that Water is mentioned with Blood.

Second-

Secondly, To consider the human History of such Places, Times, and Facts, as concern the disputed Text.

That it was the Custom of those Eastern Countries to drink Wine mix'd, is only a bare Probability of the Fact, but no Proof of that, because *Origen* expressly says it was not mix'd. Moreover, this can be no Proof for an essential, but for an accidental Mixture, as I have observ'd in my Letter to Dr. *Brett*.

Thirdly, The pretended Phraseology of the *Jewish* Language. Which if in this Case it would be admitted, and if the constant Custom was to drink Wine with the Water, the Liquor would be called the Fruit of the Vine, and not plain Wine. As particularly *Isaiab* v. 12. *The Harp and the Viol, the Tabret and Pipe, and Wine are in their Feasts.* Again, *Isaiab* lv. 1. *Buy Wine and Milk without Money.* We cannot suppose the Prophet would use the scandalous Similitude of inviting Men to be drunk; and, by common Confession, Wine without Water in those Countries was infamous.

Again, is it not said, That *Melchisedeck* brought Bread and Wine, not the Fruit of the Vine? And yet if this Phraseology had been common, it must have been so term'd, or at least you would be very loath to part with *Melchisedeck*, and make him a Type against you.

Fourthly, the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Church.

I assert, that your Proofs from Antiquity, do not come up to *Vincentius Lyrinensis's* Rule,

because the Practice of one or two Churches is no Evidence for Universality, unless it has Mr. *Leslie's* first Mark, as Episcopacy and the Sabbath. But the Mixture of the Cup, as it is plain from hence, that there was in the Western Church a total Change, by taking even the Cup from the Laity Ages before they could find out the Charge; and therefore an Innovation so early might arise from a warm Hint taken from some Allegorical Whimsy in the Fathers Heads.

Upon the whole, I conclude, that you cannot bring one Testimony for the Essentiality of the Cup; it was so far from being an universal Usage, that the Question was not started till the Schoolmen rais'd it for Speculation, and they gave their Opinions against it. It is indeed pretty strange, that the whole Christian Church for so many Ages should maintain an Essential, and not know its Value.

According to your Schemes, you must divide the Eucharist into two Divisions. First, As it is the grand Sacrifice. Secondly, As it is a Representation of Christ's Death, and consequently Christ's Water must be represented, to shew that Christ perfectly died; therefore the Water is no Part of the Sacrifice. And as to the representing materially his Death, when it is expressly laid down in the Office, I cannot see the absolute Necessity of representing it that Way, when our devouring the Elements represents his Burial in the Grave, which is one Step beyond his expiring upon the Cross.

I con-

I conclude, unhappy Friend, that your Party had been better employ'd, in consulting Logick, and the Fundamentals of Reasoning, than in appearing publickly with crude and indigested Thoughts to the World. So wishing Improvement in every good Thing, I remain your Well-wisher

M. E.

FINIS.



I conclude, unhappy Friend, that your Party
 had been better employ'd, in consulting Logic,
 and the Fundamentals of Reasoning, than in
 appearing publicly with crude and indigested
 Thoughts to the World. So wishing improve-
 ment in every good Thing, I remain your
 Well-wisher

W. E.

F85 A 9 2.

